

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1894.

I.

THEOLOGICAL PROGRESS OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY S. N. CALLENDER, D.D.

THE Heidelberg Catechism is the only confessional standard of the Reformed Church in the United States. Such it has been from the beginning. It is pre-eminently a *Confession of Faith*, as distinguished from a system or code of doctrine. Its fundamental base consists of the great cardinal articles of our Christian faith, as these are embodied in the Apostles' Creed. These articles are the postulations of supernatural facts, revealed by inspiration, and once for all, fixed, determined and complete. In their case the last word has been spoken. They are for the catechism, the ultimate norm and standard for all doctrinal definition. On the other hand, however, the Heidelberg Catechism may be said to be, in a secondary sense, a system of doctrine. But this, in the way of an endeavor to formulate the contents and necessary inferences flowing from the primary articles of faith, as apprehended by the human understanding. We have then in our confessional standard the factor of infallible, supernatural fact, to be apprehended by faith, and also an exposition of the significance and contents of

these facts, as apprehended by the sanctified mind of the Church. For the latter factor, it would be worse than folly to claim the infallibility and completeness which we justly predicate of the former. Unlike the factual body of faith, doctrine has a genesis, a growth, and we reach our doctrinal apprehensions, as in a historical way the Holy Ghost takes the things of Christ, and shows them to us. The authors of the catechism gave us the doctrinal contents of the postulates of faith as they were understood in their day. For illustration, they found the great fact of the Atonement clearly affirmed in the Creed; but in giving us their apprehension of its contents and modus, they present us with the then-prevalent Anselmic theory, which had been preceded by several discarded views, and which is now well nigh universally conceded by the Christian world to be inadequate. Hence we have in our catechism the infallible element of fact for faith, which is the same yesterday, to-day and forever; and the element of doctrine, as the growing apprehension of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, and which will grow in the comprehension of the deep things of God through all time and eternity. For the finite will never measure and comprehend the infinite.

The Reformed Church in the United States, from her earliest history, has rested confidently upon these articles of faith, and they were and still are the standard and norm of her doctrinal deliverances and practical methods. As especially pertinent to our present study, we notice her firm adhesion, amongst the others, to the article of the Holy Catholic Church. The Church of Jesus Christ has always been for her an object, a fact to be received by faith, and not by the understanding. It is an objective, substantial, spiritual reality. It is a divine organic constitution, not a human association for prudential ends. It is the permanent abode of the Holy Spirit, not in the form of an influence merely, but in personal, concrete presence. It is the living body of Christ, and its life is operative as the ministry of the Holy Ghost, through the organs and ordinances divinely comprehended in its constitution. These are prima-

rily the *Preached Word*, for the working of faith in the blinded human soul; *Baptism*, as the organ for the impartation of the divine-human life, and the comprehension of the subject in its spiritual body, and the *Lord's Supper*, as the means for the confirmation of faith, and the nourishment of the regenerate life of the believer.

Thus apprehending the Church and its divine ordinances, our Reformed Church has ever insisted that the office of the preached word, as the only divinely ordained instrumentality for this end, was primarily to awaken the sinful soul to an apprehension, by faith, of its lost condition; the necessity of its deliverance from this lost estate, and to present the means for this deliverance; and subsequently to teach the observance of all things commanded. In the fulfillment of this office the endeavor, besides the stated ministry of the word in the sanctuary, was and still is, to gather all who can be reached, and especially her baptized children, into the catechetical class where the word might be taught in a way adapted to a maturing capacity, and its truths impressed upon the memory. Thus did she seek, in the use of the means appointed by the Saviour, and made effective as the organ of the Holy Ghost, to work faith in the soul, as a preparation for the office of the Lord's Supper. This educational system was characteristic of our Reformed Church from the beginning, both in Europe and the United States.

Thus much we thought it necessary to say in definition of the Theological position of our Church at the beginning of this century. Only as we clearly apprehend her theological status at that time, can we intelligently trace its history in subsequent years.

As a result of the scholastic disputations which sprang up in the Protestant Church soon after the Reformation, there came widely to prevail a sad declension of personal holiness, and a spirit of formalism. This at length was succeeded by a reaction, and earnest souls sought to inspire a revival of deeper devotion, personal piety and Christian activity. This movement

took the form of a pietistic subjectivism. It displayed a wonderful energy, and unquestionably wrought an immense amount of good. But unfortunately it sought largely to accomplish its good work by the subordination of the divinely appointed to human methods. Instead of a preaching of the Gospel which emphasized Jesus Christ and Him crucified, it was rather in the form of an evangelistic and impassioned harangue addressed rather to the fears and emotions of the hearer. Instead of relying upon the means of grace specifically appointed by the Saviour as the instrumentalities through which the Holy Ghost works in His several offices, the endeavor was to secure the exercise of these offices in the subordination of the divine institutions to those of humanly conceived adaptation. In large measure prayer, exhortation and other human activities were relied upon. Now we have not one word to say in derogation of prayer. It enters constitutionally into the Christian life. It is absolutely essential to that life in the earthly state. But still prayer is not a means of grace in the sense that the word and sacraments are. Prayer does not work faith. Faith cometh by hearing the preached gospel, and prayer is the fruit of faith. The thought was that the Holy Spirit in answer to prayer would immediately and directly fulfill His spiritual offices, outside of the means ordained for this purpose. The one merit, however, of this system is, that many in whom faith has already been wrought by the preaching of the gospel, and who may be hesitating as to an open confession of Christ, are precipitated to a decision. But in the soul destitute of faith, this system of emotional subjectivism is powerless to work it, as thousands of experiences bear testimony.

During the latter part of the last century, this subjectivism succeeded in affecting some members of our Reformed Church. This was conspicuously the case with Rev. Philip William Otterbein, who as an ordained minister accompanied Rev. M. Schlatter on his last return to this country from Germany. He located in Lancaster, Pa., where, according to his own testimony, *he experienced a change of heart*. After ministering at

several other points, he finally took charge of the Second Reformed Church in Baltimore, Md. Here he came in contact with Dr. Coke and Francis Asbury, and others of kindred spirit. And in the ordination of Asbury as bishop, he took part with Dr. Coke. During his pastorate in Baltimore he introduced the methods employed by the then rapidly growing Methodism; and associated with some ten other congenial spirits, in the year 1800 they organized the movement which resulted in the establishment of the United Brethren Church. This infection spread to other parts of our Reformed Church. Others of her ministers were coming to think that the spirit of formalism, which, it must be confessed, had to some extent impaired the educational system, was to be overcome by the total abandonment of the system itself, and the substitution of these new measures in its place. This was again conspicuously illustrated in the case of Rev. John Winebrenner in 1820 to 1822, who was then pastor of the Reformed Church in Harrisburg, Pa., who in the face of the counsels and remonstrances of his ministerial brethren, allowed himself to be carried away from his moorings to the extent of inaugurating a schismatical movement, which resulted in the establishment of the body now known as the "Church of God."

Meanwhile the Methodist movement spread with amazing rapidity throughout the whole country, and made serious inroads into the old churches. The people were coming to regard its narrow, individualistic type of piety, its noisy demonstration and its sudden experiences, as the true form of personal holiness, as contrasted with a broader piety, which comprehended the individual in the bosom of a divine organization, and included in its reach not only man's spiritual, but also his temporal relations. The comparatively slow process of working faith by the preaching of the gospel must be supplemented by the whirlwind of an appeal to human fears, and thus hasten the regenerative activity of the Holy Ghost. This movement produced a marked effect in nearly all the Protestant churches in this country—and our Reformed Church among the rest.

Many of our ministers were carried away by it, especially in the English sections of the Church, and our educational system was rapidly losing favor.

It was in the midst of this complication that Rev. John W. Nevin, D.D., discerning the fact that the Reformed Church was drifting from her moorings, sought to arrest the defection, and opened what is usually denominated the "Anxious Bench Controversy." His penetrating mind saw clearly enough that our educational system was based upon the grace-bearing efficiency of the word and sacraments, whereas the "new measure" system, discarding this character of the sacraments, by eviscerating them of their spiritual contents, lowered them to the plane of human acts of piety and worship; and by thus eliminating their objective grace, destroyed entirely their sacramental character itself. Hence it was no longer a question of practical methods and measures, but a theological question which touched the very vitals of Christianity. At first he published several articles on the subject in the *Messenger*; but subsequently, in 1844, he made a vigorous expose of the extravagances and radical defects of the whole system, in his brochure, entitled the "Anxious Bench." The attack was unquestionably a very trenchant one, and had the immediate effect, which the writer designed, to attract wide-spread attention. Those of us whose memory carries us back to that time can vividly recall the tremendous excitement it caused. Dr. Nevin was in turn attacked from various quarters, and by no one more vigorously and unsparingly than by Rev. Dr. B. Kurtz, of the *Lutheran Observer*, then published in Baltimore. He was denounced as an enemy to all vital godliness, as a wolf in sheep's clothing, and with many like opprobrious epithets. But the arrow was truly aimed. A minister of another church, still living, one day in conversation on the subject, remarked, "I don't like Dr. Nevin. I don't like his 'Anxious Bench;' but somehow, every time I use the anxious bench, I can't help but think of him and his book." More than one of his vehement dissenters lived to see that the principle contended for was the correct one.

The effect of the Anxious Bench controversy, and the affirmation of the Educational System, had the effect to awaken the Reformed Church to a clearer apprehension of the grace-bearing character of the sacraments. Her attention was called anew to the unequivocal teaching of her own Heidelberg Catechism upon this vital point. This came upon her as something of a startling surprise. For she had allowed herself to drift passively along with the prevailing current in the direction of low rationalistic views. The Puritanic habit of thought had come largely to prevail, with its rationalistic individualism. It readily resigned in large part its educational system, on which it had relied in its better days, and accepted in no small degree the spirit of Methodistic subjectivism. As a necessary consequence, the sacraments were divested of their *sacramental* significance, and reduced to the level of church rites and ceremonies. Baptism was for it a sort of installation service by which the subject was introduced into the fellowship of the Church—a badge of membership in the association. The Lord's Supper was the commemoration of a past event, and its elements were signs of the body and blood of Christ. The spiritual movement was from the human soul out towards God, and not from God to the soul of the worshiper, as provided in the sacraments as the organs through which the Holy Spirit ministers, in answer to the prayer of faith. It was left without sacraments, in the true sense of the term, and relied for divine ministrations upon the unmediated activity of the Holy Spirit and the providence of God. No wonder then that our Reformed Church was startled when she awoke to the fact that she was in danger of being carried away from her standard by the vicious trend of prevailing theological thought. No wonder that she aroused from her supineness, to rescue the heavenly treasure of her sacraments from such a rationalistic degradation—that she reaffirmed her adhesion to the doctrine of the spiritual real presence in the Eucharist, as it had come down to her from the Reformers, was taught in her Catechism, and in well-nigh all the approved Reformed Confessions since their day. This

latter fact, namely, that the Reformed Confessions of Europe had almost without exception taught the spiritual real presence in the Eucharist, and that it was clearly and distinctly taught by John Calvin, was emphasized with a clear and sharp distinctness. And the charge was boldly made, that the branches of the Reformed Church that accepted the rationalistic degradation of the sacrament, were untrue to their traditions and confessions.

This discussion culminated in the appearance of Dr. Nevin's masterly book, entitled, "*The Mystical Presence, a Vindication of the Reformed or Calvinistic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*," in 1846. To say that this book produced a profound impression in some branches of the Reformed Church in this country, is to put it mildly. They felt themselves charged, with not only defection from their own standards, but equally with a rationalistic departure from the truth. That in response to this grave charge, theological champions should rush upon the arena, was only what was to be expected; some of them unhappily illy equipped for the contention, as the issue proved. But the surprise was that such a scholar as Rev. Charles Hodge, D.D., of Princeton, N. J., a scholar who was held, and justly too, to be an authority in questions relating to theology and symbolics, should undertake to dispute the position taken. After a delay of a number of months, he published an elaborate review of the book, in which he disputed the allegations made as to the teaching of the Reformed Confessions as to the real presence in the Eucharist. This Dr. Nevin followed with a crushing reply, which was of such force as to induce the remark by such a finished scholar as Professor Tayler Lewis, of New York, that it unquestionably called for a rejoinder, or a tacit acknowledgment of the invincibility of its argument. The rejoinder has not appeared to this day.

Had the question in debate been simply the objective contents of the sacrament, or the teaching of the Reformed Confessions on the subject, the Mystical Presence might well have been taken as a final and victorious issue. But the study inci-

dent to the contention had clearly uncovered the fact that this tenet of the Church did not stand alone; that it was organically and logically related to the whole body of Christian faith, and that its rationalistic degradation involved a like degradation of Christianity itself. It was found that this debasing movement involved a re-statement of the essential nature and contents of Christianity, of the character and constitution of the Church; of its relation to, as also the significance and office of the Incarnation; the organs and manner of the exercise of the functions of the Holy Spirit; of the office and contents of regeneration; indeed of the whole redemptive character of our holy religion. It was found that the same rationalistic spirit that would eliminate the element of mystery from the sacraments, would naturally erase the article of the Holy Catholic Church from the Apostles' Creed. For the Church would be no more an object to be apprehended by faith than a Masonic or any other fraternity, and would be as easily comprehensible by the understanding as any of these human associations. It was seen that the same logical necessity would discard *unity* as an essential attribute, as for it, there might be as many churches in the world as beneficial societies. And as for Christ's headship, that is true in some such sense, differing principally in degree, as Martin Luther is the head of the Lutheran Church. So too with the Incarnation. That was but a means to an end. Christ became incarnate to the end that He might endure suffering to satisfy divine justice, and having accomplished that purpose, and returned to heaven, the question of the continuance of the human and divine in His person in that blessed abode remained for a later elucidation. And regeneration,—well, that is a *moral* change, wrought by a *divine influence*, which the Holy Spirit, hovering about us on the wings of His omnipresence, exerts in man's behalf.

Now all this was clearly before the mind of the author of the *Mystical Presence*; and hence his drastic arraignment of the whole scheme. In the course of the discussion our Church had been brought face to face with the question of the essential na-

ture of Christianity. The question for her was, *What is Christianity?* Is it simply a scheme or plan by which God, moved by infinite pity for ruined man, determined to interpose for his rescue? That to this end He provided for a sacrificial satisfaction of the claims of divine justice by the incarnation of His Son, to the end that by His suffering the penalty of the violated law, it might be possible to forgive man's sin, and thus open the way for his salvation? That henceforth man should be challenged with the proclamation of this gracious provision in his behalf, and aided in its acceptance by the efficient influence of the ever-hovering presence of the Holy Spirit? That yielding to the helping power of this influence, men should be led to associate themselves for mutual aid, and conjointly provide for stately assembling themselves together for instruction, for spiritual edification, for prayer and praise? And that now being justified on the basis of Christ's satisfaction, and enjoying the helpful influences of the Holy Spirit, aided by a prudential association with its rites and offices, they might be able to live pious and holy lives? Is this Christianity?

On the other hand, the question was, Does not Christianity involve the fact of a new creation, and does it not present to the eye of faith a constitution and order of facts as intensely real and concrete, as the eye of sense discerns in the natural world? Does the fact that these facts and forces are spiritual impair their realism? Are we not therefore to regard the incarnation as a new creative union of the divine and human natures—that this was primarily that we *might have life*—that our human life might be brought into its intended and normal relations of union and communion with, and participation in the divine life, and that Christ's sufferings and death were the result of the sad effects and consequences entailed by sin upon our nature which He had assumed, and which must needs be overcome and exhausted? In regeneration then, are we not created anew in Christ Jesus, and made partakers of His divine-human life? Is generation in the case of the second Adam any less realistic in its communication and transmission of life than in the case of

the first Adam, the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, being the efficient giver in either case? And as to the Church, are not the children who are born anew in the second Adam as much partakers in common (the communion of saints) of his divine-human life, as the children of the first Adam are partakers of his natural life? Is not then the Church the body of Christ in a sense as *substantially* real, as the human family is the body of our common natural father—and as we know now that all the institutions, laws and offices of our domestic, social and political life find their ground, force and validity in our natural human life, and are the outward expression and revelation of that life, are we not, without escape, held to the conclusion that the organization, the offices and the sacraments are in like manner the forms of the manifestation and communication of the vital contents of the Church, as the body of Christ?

To the issue as between these two systems was our Reformed Church brought in the course of the discussion which took its rise in the Anxious Bench controversy. And thanks be to God, she was led by His Spirit to accept the latter. But the end was not yet reached.

Our Church was coming to see that the prevailing conception of the nature and constitution of the Holy Catholic Church was not adequate to the reality, but sadly at variance with its true idea. In no one particular was the divergence from the truth more lamentably marked, than as to its essential unity. True, the unity of the Church, as a theory, was a generally conceded point. This, however, was supposed to relate to its invisible, spiritual constitution and purpose; but as to its manifestation in the world, unity was not taken to be an essential attribute. The sect spirit was in the ascendant. For it the divisions and antagonisms rampant in the Protestant Church were not to be deprecated, but rather approved and defended. It argued that laboring towards a common end these divisions, in the way of emulation and competition would secure redoubled activity, would extend more widely abroad, and hasten the realization of the glory of God and the salvation of souls. The fa-

vorite illustration was, the several divisions and regiments in an army, striving conjointly for a common good. The fact, however, seems to have been largely overlooked, that no small amount of this "redoubled activity," was expended by these divisions in warring with each other. Not indeed in the use of carnal weapons, but in the form rather of raids, by which captives taken from the ranks, or the adherents of their opponents, would swell their own numbers and strength. This form of "redoubled activity" was very common during the third, fourth, fifth and sixth decades of this century. And our Reformed Church suffered more than a little from it. It was the Protestant principle, its individualism, right and valid within legitimate bounds, run out into an abnormal and vicious extreme.

Now against this iniquitous extreme, and the whole rationalistic spirit which gave birth to it, our Church proclaimed her most emphatic and vigorous protest. It was, however, at an early period in the discussions which were engaging the thought and heart of our Church, that an event transpired, and for the outcome of which she had been prepared by Dr. Nevin's elucidation of the spirit and genius of the Heidelberg Catechism and the Anxious Bench controversy, which contributed largely to determine the direction and character of the discussions which followed. It was, however, in the direct line of what had preceded. This event was the appearance of Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*, in 1845, about a year before the publication of the *Mystical Presence*. This was his inaugural address upon taking his chair in our Theological Seminary.

Dr. Schaff had recently come from Germany, where the theological questions which were just emerging above the horizon of thought in this country, had for some time been exercising the minds and hearts of many of her most learned and devout scholars. The evangelical spirit was effectively asserting itself, as over against the speculative rationalism which had so terribly demoralized the German Church. Into this contention he had entered with all the ardor of youth and the enthusiasm

of ripening scholarship. He had breathed an atmosphere which was being purged of the miasma which had polluted it during the preceding period. And he came to this country brim-full of this better life and spirit. And it could not well have been otherwise than that his first extended theological utterance should be an expression of this, to him, absorbing spirit.

The question uppermost in theological thought in Germany was, *What is the essential nature of Christianity?* This question had come to it, borne on the current of history. And with reverent attention it bowed the listening ear to its lessons. It had received different answers in preceding periods, and it was observed that these answers, both as facts of history, and the deductions of reason, were at bottom the same, and had followed in the same order. As to the voices of history, the Greek Church pronounced the distinguishing character of Christianity as consisting in its being a *revelation*, and emphasized the form of its teachings; the Roman Church decided that it was *law*, and found the realization of its idea in obedience; while the Reformation held that it was *redemption*, and revealed itself to consciousness. On the other hand, modern thought, prior to the appearance of Emanuel Kant, had defined Christianity to be primarily doctrine, and orthodoxy was the touch-stone; on the basis of Kant's Practical Reason, it was defined to be morality, a form of outward life, whose metes and bounds were definable by the chain and compass of the understanding; while in the reaction from rationalism such men as Schleiermacher found in feeling the distinguishing feature.

The results of these endeavors to define the nature and fundamental principle of Christianity were found to be that progress had been made on different lines. The conclusion reached in each of the three movements indicated was found to contain an element of truth. But these elements were affirmed in a separatistic way, each excluding or holding in damaging subordination the other two, thus totally failing in a harmonious co-ordination. It was felt that there yet needed to be grasped a deeper and more comprehensive principle,—one that would

comprehend the elements already defined, and harmonize and complete them in an all-containing unity. The claims of the intellect had been met by the definition that Christianity was doctrine; those of the will, by the response that it was morality; and those of the sensibility, that it was feeling. Now what is the broad, all-including principle which will raise all these to the plane of co-ordination and vital unity?

While Schleiermacher grievously failed in many respects to measure the significance of Christianity, yet his designation of consciousness as its primary realm, together with his pantheistic philosophy, served to point out the direction in which the sought-for principle was to be found. His affirmation that human consciousness constituted an essential factor, taken with the divine immanence, although he affirmed this latter element in a grossly defective form, served to give rise to the conviction that to measure the distinctive character of Christianity we must discern the principle that would include them both. And thus was the result logically reached, that the all-containing principle was life itself, at once divine and human. Hence the conclusion, that the distinctive characteristic of Christianity is that it is a divine-human substantial life, comprehending at once every department of human life in a harmonious unity, thus raising humanity to its ideal.

It did not take long to make it manifest that this conception of Christianity invested the incarnation with a vastly enlarged significance, and made it determinative of the contents of Christianity, and formative of its outward organization in the church. As then the inner constitution and contents of our holy religion had grown in the apprehension of the human mind, just as the Christian consciousness had grown and developed, so the Church had historically developed in its form, and the apprehension of its own significance and the spiritual efficiency of its offices. So that the doctrine of *historical development*, was accepted as the organon for the growth and evolution of Christianity, both in its inner life and its organized manifestation.

When Dr. Schaff reached this country he was fully and

enthusiastically in sympathy with these later evangelical movements in Germany. In his inaugural, to wit: *The Principle of Protestantism*, he clearly defined his position in this regard, and furnished us with the most powerful vindication of the legitimacy of Protestantism which had appeared in the English language based on the doctrine of *Historical Development*. He held that Protestantism was a legitimate out-birth of the life of the Church preceding the Reformation; that it was the expression of a principle complementary to and complete of the principle of authority as embodied in the old Church, and that in the *Church of the Future* will be embodied the two principles, now separately expressed, in one harmonious unity.

The accepted doctrine of Historical Development of course involved the true churchly character of the pre-reformation Church. And Dr. Schaff distinctly affirmed it. "This was the feather that broke the camel's back." During the Anxious Bench controversy there were some of our ministers who had become deeply tinctured with the puritanic and rationalistic spirit then prevalent, but had taken no active part in the discussion. Some of them had been violent in their assaults upon the Church of Rome, and had denied its title to be called a true Church. When, therefore, Dr. Schaff conceded that it was a branch of the Church of Christ, they broke their reserve and organized an attack. This was the inauguration of the controversy within the bounds of our own Church. Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Berg, at that time pastor of the old Race Street Church in Philadelphia, and a man of considerable prominence in our Church, was a noted anti-papery polemic, and was at the same time the editor of a periodical called the *Protestant Banner*. When *The Principle of Protestantism* appeared he was horrified, and denounced it as rank with heresy. But the Inaugural Address itself was not all. As an appendix to it was published a sermon by Dr. Nevin, on Catholic Unity, delivered at the Triennial Convention at Harrisburg, in which he dwelt specifically upon the Mystical Union subsisting between Christ and believers, the vital organism of the Church, and the

spiritual real presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. This, together with Dr. Nevin's highly favorable introduction to the book, and the fact that Dr. Berg had learned from his protege, a convert of his, who professed to have been a monk at La Trappe, in France, and whom he had sent to the Seminary to study for the Protestant ministry, and, by the way, whose after record was anything but savory, that Dr. Nevin taught that the Church of Rome was a branch of the true Church, caused him to train his guns rather upon Dr. Nevin than upon the book, although this last was, in his estimation, hopelessly bad. Dr. Berg, in his bitter attacks in *The Protestant Banner*, denounced Dr. Nevin's published views and teachings as false and heretical, and accused him of teaching a doctrine contrary to the Heidelberg Catechism; he continued to denounce the Church of Rome as anti-christ, and held Protestantism to be the only true Church. Dr. Nevin at first replied in the *Messenger*, in a series of articles under the title of *Pseudo-protestantism*, in which he denied that Protestantism was the only true form of Christianity, and pointed out that the principle of Protestantism, while true and valid, had yet run out into an abnormal extreme, and loudly called for readjustment and restatement, in doctrine and church methods.

Dr. Berg's crusade culminated in inducing the Classis of Philadelphia to arraign, in an irregular way, the "Principle of Protestantism," together with Drs. Nevin and Schaff before the Synod, on what were, in reality, charges of heresy. It not being essential to the purpose of this paper to go into details, it will suffice to say generally that the accused waived the irregularity of the proceedings of the Classis of Philadelphia, and accepted the issue. After a patient and extended hearing at its meeting in York, Pa., in 1845, Synod, by an almost unanimous vote, vindicated both the "Principle of Protestantism," and the Professors in our Seminary as being free from heresy.

Thus was the discussion of the *Church Question* fully and fairly inaugurated. After the deliverance of the Synod at

York, Pa., the controversy increased in intensity and earnestness. Wide-spread attention was attracted in the American and European churches. Our Professors maintained their position, holding to the historical and organic character of the Church, as the body of Christ, animated by His divine-human life through the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost; the mystical union of the believer with Christ in partaking of His divine-human life, and the spiritual real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Along these lines did the discussion run. All this was found to be in antagonism to the prevailing puritanical, rationalistic conceptions. Hence it was that Dr. Nevin sought, in 1846, to give a full logical statement of the whole contention, as it presented itself to his mind, in his *Mystical Presence*.

It was the searching exposure of the deficiency of Protestantism, in the extreme rationalistic form in which it was held in this country, on the one hand, and the affirmation of the organic, historical continuity of the Church, from the beginning, on the other, that awakened the keen interest, and indeed anxious apprehensions of many both outside and within our own church. He denounced the *sect spirit*, then rampant, as anti-christ, and published a trenchant tract on the subject. He accused the puritan spirit of discarding the true mystical character of the Church and the sacraments, indeed, of reducing the church to the low level of a human institution or association, and of divesting the sacraments of their spiritual contents; of making Christianity to be a purely individualistic, subjective interest, and its outward organization a matter for human prudential adjustment. He seemed almost ruthlessly to thrust the probe to the very core of the festering sore with which Protestantism, in its rationalistic form, was afflicted. On the other hand he most heroically held for the organic, vital and historical character of the body of Christ, the abiding home of the Holy Ghost. He held that true Protestantism was a legitimate historical development of the life of the Church; that this life had passed through the evolution of the ages, and at no time, however imperfect in form and doctrinal

apprehension, was to be discarded as other than the true body of Christ; that to reject the Church for a thousand years, as was done by the then prevailing rationalistic spirit, as having fallen under the power of the devil, was to discard its spiritual heritage and patrimony, and cut itself off from the great and good of the ages past. He held that the remedy for our Protestantism was not in repristination; for then must we repeat the historical growth of the past. The Church had passed through its childhood, its youth, its early manhood, and now must it press forward, gathering in one the labors and experience of all its past, into the completion of *the Church of the Future*.

It was while he was contrasting the assumptions of puritanism, as to the character of the Church, with those that prevailed in the early Church—its discordant and separatistic spirit, with the rigidity of its institutions, and its authoritative teachings—that the greatest anxiety and alarm were felt. What the Church was in the days of Cyprian and Augustine, standing, however, on the firm basis of the Apostles' Creed, was made to appear to many almost as a revelation, and some were prompted to ask the question: "Is not Protestantism hopelessly wrong?" A few answered the question in the affirmative, and passed over to the Roman Church. But at that very time Dr. Nevin gave to the Church and the world what was perhaps the strongest polemic, which had then appeared in this country, against the assumptions of the Roman Church, in the controversy with Dr. O. A. Brownson.

In all this discussion, as already remarked, *historical development*, or if you will so call it, *evolution*, and that too before Darwin had signalized it, was held to be the organon of the life of the Church. In passing through its early stages, it was conditioned by its environment, and the then-existing phase of our humanity. It was necessary that the principle of authority should first assert itself and serve as a schoolmaster to prepare man for the exercise of a free individual will. And this is the conclusion to which our church was conducted by this long and anxious discussion. And now we can stand by and witness the

anxious march of other churches in this country, *for they must*, in one form or another, traverse the same ground. We know from experience what the final outcome for them must be.

The next advance movement in our church was the construction of a Liturgy. It was felt that the recognized character of the Church called for a carefully prepared form of uniform worship. The common participation in the life of Christ called for a personal participation in the worship of the sanctuary. An abnormal opposition to forms had consigned all the offices of worship to the minister, except a share in the singing of praise, leaving the laity in the attitude of listeners. A liturgical committee was appointed, which produced what was called the *Provisional Liturgy*. Soon a more thorough work was called for. It was while this further work was in progress that differences arose within the Church, which, together with fears which had arisen during the discussion of the church question, and which were intensified by the transition of a few of our ministers to the Church of Rome, gave rise to the apprehension that the churchly movement in progress involved a latent "Romanizing tendency." This gave rise to a vigorous contention within our own bounds, which continued a number of years. The trouble with some was that they did not discern that the exposure of the weaknesses and wrong extreme development of Protestantism was not an attack upon its historical legitimacy and validity, and the vindication of the title of the Church of Rome to a true churchly character, was not to assert that the proper course for Protestantism was to abandon its principle, and accept the status of by-gone ages; whereas, the course of the discussion was to conserve both principles, and to point to their harmonious adjustment in the Church of the Future. This later discussion soon extended to other points of doctrine, and centered at last in the question: *Is the Incarnation of Christ, or His sufferings, to be regarded as the central fact of Christianity?* It was the old puritanical doctrine of the centrality of the Atonement as against the christological, which holds for the centrality of the person of Christ, making

Him to be the alpha and the omega, and not a mere means to an end.

This controversy became very heated, and at one time threatened a division of the Church; but by the gracious leadings of the Holy Spirit it was brought to a close by the creation of the *Peace Commission*, when after cool and prayerful deliberation, both sides found themselves in harmony on the basis of the Heidelberg Catechism, and reached an agreement on the question of centrality, in the way of a compromise, sufficiently broad for both to stand upon, by the adoption of Article I., under the head of Doctrine, as contained in the report, which was adopted by the General Synod at its meeting in the city of Tiffin, Ohio, in the year 1881, which is as follows:

"We recognize in Jesus Christ and His sacrifice for fallen man, the foundation and source of our whole salvation."

At that same meeting of General Synod, in accordance with recommendation in the Report of the Peace Commission, a Liturgical Committee was appointed, who with great labor and care constructed the *Directory of Worship*, which in due time was accepted and adopted as an Ordinance of the Church.

As the outcome of the years of travail and conflict, through which it had pleased God in his wisdom and goodness, by the inspiration of his Holy Spirit, to conduct our church, we discern a clearer conscious apprehension of the distinction of Christianity as an organic order of fact, historically real, at once spiritual and yet comprehending the whole order of nature, to be apprehended by faith, and Christianity as a system of doctrinal truth to be apprehended by the understanding. As to the factual realm of faith, we recognize Jesus Christ, "the Word made flesh," as the Head of His body, the Church, from whom radiate all the nerves of life and energy—as also the pulsating heart, from whom flow to the remotest member of His body all the streams of grace and salvation. As to the realm of doctrine or systematic theology, we have been raised to a higher plane. While we accept the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty, the old Calvinistic principle, as an un-

deniable and most precious truth, we yet discern it as merely co-ordinate with, or, if needs be, comprehending, the natural attributes of God, but neither organically nor logically comprehending His moral attributes. As such, it is but partial, not comprehending for thought the fullness of the Godhead. It, at best, is but a secondary principle, itself involved in something more profoundly fundamental. As the primary principle, comprehending the whole being of God, at once natural and moral, we discern in *love, the eternal norm of the divine will*. This alone can ever prove a sufficiently comprehensive and ultimate principle from which sanctified reason can deduce an adequate and exhaustive theology.

II.

THOUGHTS ON LITURGICAL CULTURE.

BY REV. A. R. KREMER, D.D.

QUESTIONS on Christian cultus will arise from time to time, and will not cease to be discussed, so long as Christian people are not in perfect accord on all doctrines and customs in the Church catholic.

The liturgical question is still open for discussion, and is by no means consigned to the place of fossils and things that have had their day. A Christian denomination may by solemn agreement agree to disagree on certain points on the subject; but it surely cannot mean that the subject itself must hereafter be forbidden fruit to be neither touched, tasted nor handled. Nor is it something dead and buried out of sight beyond all hope of a resurrection. It may be thought by some that the liturgy is dead; and in some places there may be good reason for the supposition—the more's the pity, inasmuch as all that is good and valuable in liturgies is, in such communities, no benefit to the people. Of course, it may be affirmed that a liturgy (a real liturgy) is an unmitigated evil, and the less known of it the better. But in the Reformed Church such an assertion could have no weight, for, as all ought to know, a full, strong, and moderately responsive liturgy, or Directory of Worship, has been adopted with great unanimity as the book of common prayer and service for the whole denomination. So that subjects relating to the liturgy are, or should be, of common interest. It is not necessary, nor would it be edifying, to renew the old discussions and fight the old battles. It would be labor lost to thresh the old straw, from which the grains of

corn have long ago separated. But that is no reason why the subject should not be publicly considered in any way, or be allowed to pass out of view and out of mind. That would imply that a liturgy is something for the Church to adopt simply in order to get rid of it, and have no more bother with it. But who will say that? Whatever some may *think*, they will still not venture to *say*, that the fruit of all those years of conflict, war, and finally peaceful solution, was of no consequence, a hollow peace, the emblem of it all being a *book*, a harmless book, occupying usually some quiet and obscure corner in the minister's library, to be taken down several times in a year to do service on sacramental and special occasions, and so manipulated, perhaps, as to keep the idea of a real liturgy as completely as possible from the minds of the people.

But such is not the case, and there is no denying that the Book exists, with all the authority, rights, and blessings, which the Reformed Church in the United States could endow it with and bestow upon it. It was prepared and ordered in good faith for clergy and laity, for their use and spiritual edification, and not to serve as a ruse for ending a controversy, or to be used (once for all) as oil to be poured out upon the troubled sea, the only desideratum seeming to be *calm, quiet, peace*. Surely if such were the only outcome of long and earnest labor for the honor, beauty and glory of Zion, and the praise of God, then it will be vain hereafter to talk of forward movements in the Church, of developments in doctrine, knowledge, cultus, life, growth; rather it will be in order to affirm that progress has no place in the history of Christ's kingdom; that the Church is like a stereotyped book and the everlasting hills, ever the same and finished.

But why should this subject lie still and not be allowed to move itself? Are there no questions to be asked and answered concerning it? Does it offer no suggestions to be considered even in these sweet days of peace? Indeed it would seem that now is the most auspicious time for all this, when we are in no fighting mood, and especially as there is plenty of room for dis-

cussion within the limits of the peace compact, and within the lids of the Directory of Worship. The settlement of the controversy does not carry with it the obligation of eternal silence. We are all of one mind, for instance, that Christ made atonement for sin, and yet a respectable number of ministers in all orthodox churches still keep on preaching about it, notwithstanding all the temptations to give it a decent burial and electrify audiences on some of the brilliant nineteenth century matters; we (some of us) still talk about faith, hope, charity, repentance, justification, as if these topics were just newly born; and the steady-going, quiet, orthodox people listen to it all as patiently as did earnest people when St. Paul stirred up all Judaism and Greek heathenism with the preaching of Christ crucified and justification by faith in His name. Then surely it would seem to be in order to advance some ideas on such a public ordinance of the Church as the Liturgy, which contains the scheme of worship which the Church in her wisdom prepared and constitutionally adopted.

Let this suffice; we mean to direct attention to the advantages of liturgical culture to the minister; whence the corollary: the corresponding advantages to the people; for if a minister has the true apostolic and Christian spirit, he will receive no gifts that may not redound to the benefit of the people under his pastoral care.

Not the least of the sacred duties of the minister is leading the public devotions of the congregation. And surely no one will say that it makes little difference how it is done. Even those who persistently call everything before the sermon "preliminary exercises," take note of the manner in which they are performed. The value of a public church service is very much affected by the character, in form and substance, of what are called the devotional parts of it, as well as by the preaching. Yet, as with everything else, the judgments on these will differ according to mood, temperament, degrees of intelligence, and especially the existence or non-existence of liturgical culture and knowledge. Devotional services that would grate upon

the ears and minds, and perhaps nerves, of some, might be very agreeable to others, and in a manner edifying. A thousand voices singing "Where is my boy to-night?" may be regarded by many as the Ultima Thule of human effort in Christian song service; while many others, differently trained and taught, could have no patience with such lugubrious sentimentalism as a part of Christian worship. On the other hand the Gloria or Te Deum, or some other grand hymn of the ages would scarcely be tolerated in some churches, where hymns, so-called, about this or that good or bad thing are most hospitably treated. *De gustibus non est disputandum*; but there is accounting for tastes; they are to be accounted for by the varieties in education. Even the most plain and illiterate people, trained under the liturgical and churchly system, are as much in sympathy with the hymns and prayers and other services embraced in it as the most refined liturgist. Such people are also quick to notice any defect in utterance, tone, or emphasis in one who leads in public worship. I once heard a Roman Catholic dignitary say that when a priest, as occasionally happens, makes a mistake, however slight, in the services of the altar, the people, of every degree of intelligence, are scandalized by it. This is another illustration of the proverb: As is the priest, so are the people. Culture in the minister very easily affects the people, the exceptions being the unsympathetic ones, and others that are not susceptible of fine impressions. This indicates the importance of a minister's fitness for his several offices and duties, among which by no means least are those that pertain to what are properly called his priestly functions; that is, the liturgical office.

In churches where the service is "free," and no liturgy is used, there is still an unwritten liturgy; or if written at all it is after the service has been performed, as in the case of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, while Mr. Beecher was pastor, and of some others. But even where the service comes and goes with the sound of the minister's voice, there is a liturgy of some kind, the quality of it depending, of course, upon the per-

son who utters it. He is the mouth-piece of the congregation more truly than if he used prescribed forms; for in the latter case the people are dependent on the book rather than on the minister for the words of the occasion. It will not be disputed then that the mouth-piece, so-called, should have qualifications peculiarly adapted to the office of conducting the devotional services of the Church. His work in this department can be done well, indifferently or badly, like any other work, and no one will deny that it should be done well. But, then, is there a standard by which to judge? As already intimated, what one would call proper and good, another might regard as the very opposite. Here is a nice point, and not supremely easy to settle. But the problem is not beyond solution. There are ground principles in liturgies which are axiomatic, and others, if not that, are at least of sufficiently catholic a nature to command a consensus of the cultured and liberal-minded among the different tribes of Israel. Christian people are more nearly agreed on this subject, after all, than most people imagine. As in dogmatics, the differences among the so-called orthodox is more formal than essential, so in regard to cultus it is about the same. There has been many a war after which the contestants wondered what it was all about. So of doctrinal and liturgical battles; the leading and essential ideas and beliefs have been common, with only slight differences among the liberal of all parties; and this always appears at the restoration of peace. It may be then assumed that there is an accepted standard of Christian cultus, accepted by all that are qualified to speak on the subject. The difference of opinion is on particulars, on certain forms, and on the extent of using a book in public worship, and not on the essentials of ritual. There are extreme ritualists who seem to make a fetish of the ritual, and who then really worship an idol; but that is no reason why others should not use the ritual in the worship of God.

But even if what has just been affirmed in regard to *consensus* should prove to be incorrect, it is still certain that, written or unwritten, all Christian Churches have a ritual and a cultus.

Where the entire worship is without a book, hymns excepted, there is, nevertheless, an order of service that is scrupulously followed, in which the prayers are supposed to be extemporized, or at least delivered in such form and manner. All will agree that not a few such public prayers (in which it is supposed the congregation mentally join) are more or less faulty, some exceedingly so, in which there seems to be small devotion and smaller sense. Now, it is here assumed, in this discussion, that there is perfect agreement among intelligent Christians that the minister in offering free prayer should be able to evolve from his mind and heart a form of sound words that may properly express the needs, desires, thankfulness and holy aspirations of the believing souls that are expected to join in the worship; or, in the language of Holy Scripture, that he should pray with the Spirit and with the understanding. In some pulpits there seems to be neither the one nor the other in the prayers offered; in some others, spirituality, but so incoherently expressed as to be understood only by such as have that peculiar gift of tongues or of discerning of spirits; and in many other pulpits the prayers (so called) have abundance of the understanding, but little or nothing spiritual. Here is where many of the intellectual and many of the popular pulpits err. I say pulpits, for in such quarters there is scarcely any idea of an altar. Take Mr. Beecher's liturgy, for example, (as set up in due form by his famous reporter, Mr. Ellenwood)—that is, the prayers before and after sermon. They surely read well, and reveal the peculiar and remarkable genius of their eloquent author, as certainly as do the sermons. But do they come up to the true idea of common prayer for minister and people? Not by a long way, unless we have entirely misunderstood the Bible and the historical Church. They are full of cold intellectuality, startling thoughts and flashing ideas; and only here and there, like an oasis in a desert, are true expressions of a child of God seeking after Him and giving Him thanks. For the most part, though beautiful in their way, they are deistical in form and expression, seldom in Christ's

name, with Christ rarely mentioned except in the last sentence: "To Thy name shall be the praise, Father, Son and Spirit." Sometimes the closing prayer, which is brief, comes up very closely to the liturgical standard; and one now before me closes with: "We ask it for Christ Jesus' sake"—a very rare thing in Mr. Beecher's prayers. Indeed, in one of his sermons he has an argument (such as it is) against saying "in Christ's name," or "for Christ's sake," and the instance just referred to is the only one I have seen. And yet Beecher's public prayers are like lovely gardens of the Lord as compared with many others that are vented in high-priced pulpits. Brilliant rhetoric, mercurial eloquence, lofty flights; or brave dashes at some of the naughty doings of men here and men there, in high places and in low places; side thrusts at persons that might chance to be present, or a hawk-like descent upon the heads (figuratively speaking) of politicians and statesmen, whom they would fear to meet face to face; and so on to the end of the chapter of prayers falsely so called. Then a smaller race, the imitators, whose productions, called prayers, are simply intolerable except with people who have been accustomed to them all their lives and have been taught that a liturgy is an unmitigated evil. Some of these pulpiteers fly at the Lord like savages, in their "prayers," cutting and slashing right and left, as if the Lord should rather fear *them* than that they should stand in holy awe before *Him*. So from the highest intellectual and social grade of the ministry to the lowest we find most flagrant violations of the laws and principles of Christian cultus in public worship. The simplicity of ignorance can be excused. Improprieties uttered in prayer meetings by honest and simple-minded people are easily condoned. I never felt scandalized when a certain plain godly man, poor in worldly knowledge, but rich in Christian faith, would pour out his complaints before the Lord and confess that "we are so lazy in spiritual things and so good-for-nothing;" far better than many a so-called prayer made up of brilliant rhetorical periods for the delectation of a fashionable audience.

What has now been said relates, in general, to the important

matter of conducting public worship, or leading a Christian congregation in offering prayer and thanksgiving to God. This brings us to consider the qualifications in a minister for such work; that is, liturgical culture; and its advantages to the minister of the gospel and the people to whom he ministers.

One of the divisions in the great science of Theology is *Liturgics*. It is itself a science, and the minister should be thoroughly acquainted with it, because it treats of everything belonging to the service of the altar, where especially he exercises his priestly functions. Now, if the question were asked whether any good Christian is qualified to conduct this part of public worship, the answer would readily be given, from all directions, in the negative. Then it must be acknowledged that liturgical culture in some degree, and of some character, is necessary. But no one can become well versed, or at all, in this science unless he learns the nature and history of Christian liturgies, and what a liturgy or book of common worship ought to be, and becomes familiar with the book of his own denomination, which of course ought to be in harmony with the liturgical ideas in the Church from the beginning. The liturgy should contain all the essentials of worship and administration, and the minister should be guided by its genius and spirit even when he offers prayers in public without the direct use of the book. For, the preparation of a true liturgy has required the united wisdom and piety of the Church of all ages, and must contain (not in dogmatic, but in liturgical form) all the essential doctrines of Christianity. This being so, is it in keeping with the general culture of a minister that he should be unlearned, inexact and slipshod in the matter of worship? The Holy Spirit teaches how to pray, but He also employs the teaching Church to do this. The Spirit also helps a minister in preaching; then are theological seminaries of no use?

This culture in a minister will place him in touch with the Holy Catholic Church of all ages. It will show him that the Church as the body of Christ, the Church Catholic, has a voice, and utters it in prayer and praise, and that the individual

member has a voice only as being in communion with the Church. Then if the minister would not create discord in the body of Christ he must be skilled in liturgical knowledge, which is essential to a right understanding and appreciation of the article of faith: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church." "That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Romans 15: 6). There is properly one language for the Israel of God, which may be, however, and often is, corrupted by the ideas and phraseology of ignorance and of the world, just because the language is by many not understood. True liturgical language differs widely from those individually conceived thoughts and words in prayer which wander off into the descriptive, doctrinal, sentimental, oratorical, and often boldly conversational and even mandatory. John Wesley, in one of his writings, is emphatic in denunciation of all such improprieties, not to say blasphemies, in prayer; and it is well known that to the end of his life he was ardently attached to the scheme of common prayer that was an inheritance from Christ through the Church. It was liturgical culture that aided him materially as a leader of thought and action in the religious world; and that culture imparted a dignity and moral grandeur to the man that nothing else could have done. How could it be otherwise, since liturgical culture brings one into the inmost sanctuary of the Divine presence? It is in Christian cultus that the soul of the believer is "caught up into the third heaven" to hear "unspeakable words," and the words formed and uttered in the Church militant should be as nearly like the language of Paradise as the conditions of earth will allow, or as nearly as the Church in the wilderness can give expression to the thoughts and formulate the language of the heavenly Canaan; and the sacred Scriptures do not leave us altogether in the dark in regard to that language.

True liturgical culture will hold a minister to right words and thoughts in prayer; that is, free prayer, so much required in evangelical churches. It is not easy to know always how to express oneself properly when required to lead in prayer;

hence the great importance of liturgical knowledge. The amount of ignorance on this subject is truly amazing, and it crops out very frequently in the making of public and, what is supposed to be, common prayer. It would almost seem that some ministers go through this service chiefly to conform to a decent custom, and fill up a certain space. There are repetitions of the Divine name that affect unpleasantly devoutly refined ears, and "we pray Thee" and "we thank Thee" repeated at almost every brief sentence. Worse still are the reasons given in the prayer for engaging in the service, and actually telling the Lord that we are here, what we are here for, what we are doing and propose to do; how we were created, and how we lapsed into sin, and so on. I heard a prayer thirty minutes in length (thoroughly edifying to the many grim old predestinarians that were taking it all in), in which the five points of Calvinism were made as clear as sunbeams. And that was one among thousands equally objectionable. In many such prayers the real praying is by far the least part. What is the matter? Just this: Those ministers received no training, or at least no proper training, in liturgics. For three years they heard lectures on every branch of theology except this one; much on preaching, little or nothing on praying, as if that came by "spontaneous generation." But Christ taught His disciples to pray, and the Church should follow His example in this as in everything else; and the theological seminary that fails to teach liturgics, also fails to a great extent to understand a theological seminary's business.

This knowledge is the holiest and best of all knowledge, and implies general theological training and culture. It is the best, because prayer, including the sacraments, is the means by which we hold communion with God. There is no question here in regard to the prayers of God's poor illiterate children; no matter how framed, they are sweet incense before the throne, and most acceptable; but, as in other things, so in this, the minister's liturgical culture should be immeasurably above theirs. He has pious people in his parish who can and do read

the Scriptures to their own spiritual edification; but that is no reason why they should be regarded as proper persons to read the Scriptures publicly. For reasons just stated, liturgical culture is the highest and most important, and is so especially because, back of it, there must be general theological knowledge. The history and philosophy of Christian worship can only be understood in connection with the history and philosophy of Christianity itself. The whole subject of theology is involved in this one department of cultus; and therefore the minister who has made an earnest study of it, and mastered it in all its contents and relations, has risen to a height from which he can survey and sweep, as with a telescope, the whole expanse and circle of theological science.

Then, too, liturgical culture in a minister tends to strengthen and increase his personal piety. On this subject he comes nearer to God than when engaged on any other. He may, indeed, be a mere formalist, and so, a hypocrite; but he can be all that, and shun a liturgy as if it were a viper. We speak now of ministers who are sincere and godly men; and it seems fair to believe that one of the chief means of a high order of spirituality in them is to be found in the cultivation of this peculiarly sacred branch of Christian theology. *Pectus theologicum facit* expresses a great truth—that Christian piety is the natural companion of theological culture, and that an ungodly theologian is a contradiction and a monstrosity. The idea is, that study of the sacred science promotes personal piety in the student; how much more, then, that branch of it which relates to the Christian's contact and communion with the Most High? No sincere person can study the Lord's Prayer and sound its mighty depths without gaining spiritual enlargement. But to do this properly, to study the model prayer as it ought to be studied, is to take a full course in liturgics. Such study must necessarily prevent the loose, disjointed and profane exhibitions that so often mar the services of God's house; and the culture gained from such study must promote true Christian devotion and piety.

All such benefit to the minister, as already remarked, must be of corresponding benefit to the people. The pastor who properly conducts public religious services, and at the same time is possessed of a true devotional spirit, ennobled and refined by a genuine liturgical culture, must be in this, as well as in any other capacity, a medium of great apiritual good to the people of his charge. This is true whether the service of the altar is conducted with or without the book. Only one versed in liturgies can use a liturgy properly, or render a free service as it ought to be rendered. The manner in which prayers and other offices are frequently read is quite sufficient to drive out of the church door every particle of devotion that may have been brought in by devout people. To be able to conduct properly a liturgical service is the result of thorough theoretical and practical training, and is an essential part of liturgical culture, which consists not only in theory, but equally in the ability to put theory into practice. Possessed of that acquired gift, the minister is a leader that can be followed, whose voice becomes the voice of the congregation, or as many as join in the service. All who have made this subject a study know well how a congregation is affected by excellence in the performance at the altar—real excellence, such as is recognized by good people; for they are not slow to detect any or the least thing bordering on affectation in the minister's performance; the purity of simplicity and the simplicity of purity, backed and directed by knowledge, is what satisfies and edifies them; and only shallow and vain persons can endure and admire the altar and pulpit airs and attitudes of a superficial charlatan. Of course some vain persons may be attracted by the outward beauty of a sincerely and piously rendered liturgical service; but devout people are spiritually benefited, and their sense of the beautiful in worship is cultivated. It helps them to see the "beauties of holiness," and to form some correct idea of the worship of heaven. This finest of the fine arts, under the direction of a true minister, is supremely elevating, leading and alluring the mind toward the highest good, the spiritual and the heavenly.

If the service is free, the congregation will be greatly benefited if the officiating minister is a thorough liturgist. If he has no correct knowledge of Christian cultus, and if he prays in a hap-hazard, loose and desultory manner, he will cultivate in his people a low and vicious religious taste. And which of the two results is the more desirable? Some questions answer themselves.

The commonest people, and the most uncultured, as well as any others, are richly benefited by a minister well versed in this branch of theology. The higher his culture in this respect, the more easily he can adapt himself to the ignorance, prejudices, or simplicity of his flock. If the reverse is true, then what is the higher general and theological learning good for? For if the gospel is not in a very special sense for the poor and ignorant, then the good and wise of all the Christian ages have been under a great misapprehension. And in this particular matter of worship none are so able and willing to guide, instruct and elevate the minds of the common people as are those who best understand the nature and character of Christian worship and service.

The Reformed Church is, or ought to be, deeply interested on this subject. The many years of earnest labor in this work, and the results obtained, should not be forgotten nor lightly esteemed. Nor do we think there was much in the controversy of those days to be regretted in this time of peace. Hard blows were delivered from both sides, and it looked more than once as if the old mother Church of Reformed Protestantism would be rent in twain; but both sides were equally in earnest and equally conscientious, both seeking after what might be found true and right in Christian cultus, and each producing a provisional liturgy which proved beyond question that the issue was not liturgy or no liturgy. And still more on the conservative side (as it may be called) there was no insisting on a mere hand-book of necessary forms for the convenience of the minister, but, as their liturgical work proved, they too occupied an advanced position on this question. War of such character is far from being an unmitigated evil; and those on either side

who stood off during the conflict, and uttered harsh things without wisdom, were generally the most disagreeable partisans, and many times more malignant than they who earnestly, and with more or less intelligence, contended for what they believed to be the truth. Peace, when it is real and genuine, is heaven itself; but that lazy kind which is the companion of indifference, or false security, is more to be dreaded than war. When Christ came into the world there was profound peace throughout the vast Roman dominions; but it was the silent calm that precedes the bursting cloud and quaking earth—war and its horrors. The peace of Christ, of which the angels sang, can come only through sharp conflict. "I came not to send peace, but a sword." Matt. 10: 34. It is through war of ideas and opinions that truth appears, bright and glorious; and the liturgical war through which the Church passed, while by no means free from sin, which is an element in all such contests, showed the active working of the mind of the Church, and her zeal in seeking after a cultus that would be another jewel in the crown of the Lord's Bride. And as the sword cannot devour forever, and especially as the Spirit of Christ moved upon the troubled waters and filled our Zion with the spirit of love and peace, there came a day, in God's own good time, when it was enough and the war was over; and in due season the result appeared in a consensus uniting all wings and parties, and in a formulated cultus that is the possession of all alike in the noble historic Reformed Church in the United States.

Now the question is, Shall interest in liturgics continue to be cultivated and fostered? or shall the coming generation of clergy and laity care little or nothing about it? Shall ministers cease to occupy their minds with the subject, or shall their later contemporaries and successors give it small attention, and so lack that culture which should be the glory of their theological acquisitions?

What has now been said has not been suggested by the spirit of controversy, with the design of stirring up old feuds. We are at peace, thanks to the God of peace; and we do not wish

to see the old tattered ensigns of war floating over our beloved Zion. *But we have a liturgy*, which is the common possession of every son and daughter of the Reformed Church in the United States; and it is of such a character and quality that it implies and demands all that is said in this argument, and much more. It enshrines the results of our liturgical labors; and the minister who may regard it simply as a covenant sign of peace, a heap of stones set up to remind every one belligerently inclined of an agreement to let by-gones be by-gones and not mention the subject again, has yet everything to learn in liturgics. On the contrary, the Book is an ordinance of the Church, and the Church has thus set her seal on the right and the duty of her ministry to become well grounded in the liturgical principles contained therein. A minister of the Reformed Church not possessed of the liturgical culture which her Directory of Worship implies, and demands of her clergy, is, to put it mildly, rather one-sided in his qualifications for the sacred calling.

Our younger clergy may not fully realize the fact—but the older ones do—that our liturgical studies during the classic and golden period of our history as a church, completely revolutionized the thought and practice of a former generation in regard to worship. The improvement in our public services, even where the Book has been sparingly used, has been truly wonderful. Formerly, within the memory of many of us, there were scarcely any ideas at all on the subject among the laity, and none to spare among the ministry. Not a few of the latter are yet living, and active in their holy calling, who for years, in the olden time, conducted public services without a thought of any liturgical principle that should rule. They surely remember how they searched through the old hymn-book for the most startling hymns to be sung at wicked sinners. How I used to hear my good pastor read, with thrilling and nervous action and emphasis, about every third time he preached, the fiery hymn:

"Your way is dark and leads to hell;
Why will you persevere?
Can you in endless torments dwell,
Shut up in black despair?"

And all liked it, too, just as a born slave likes his bondage; for when such hymns were read we could hardly wait for the lively performance that was sure to follow when the text (a terrible one) would be announced. They seemed to know nothing about a Church Year, and the people would have been amazed at the mention of it; so that Christmas, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost were never thought of as having any relation to each other in the order of time. If Whitsunday had immediately followed Easter, there would have been no questions asked. Advent, Epiphany, Lent, and Trinity were seen in the secular almanac; and it was generally understood that there those mystic things belonged, and there only. They seemed perfectly proper in such place, the same as those mysterious astronomical signs, which were universally acknowledged as essential to an almanac. The preaching, as many can testify, was good, but exceedingly defective in this, that the sermons, to each other, had no logical nor theological relations. So, in crazy-quilt style, the preacher, as to the order of his sermons, proceeded from year to year. No wonder, then, that something of a tempest was raised when the shaking-up was begun by the leaders in the Church. And now what do we see and hear? The Creed is as familiar, in a majority of our churches, as the alphabet; the mention of the Church Year and its holy seasons (not *days* simply) excites no wonder; the Lord's Prayer is said in unison without a word of protest; the sight of a cross on or within a church no longer racks the nerves or excites the horror of men and women; and so we might go on. Those same ministers, many of them, though nearing the line that marks their earthly pilgrimage, having intelligently fallen in with the revolution, have, during all these better years, pursued their high calling in a new and awakened state of existence, so that now, venerable with age, they are still young in spirit from breathing the atmosphere of a true church life. The change has been immensely for the better; the advance has been in the right direction; and let our vigorous young clergymen, and those coming on, see to it that there be no halt and

no retrograde movement in the matter of thorough liturgical culture.

It has not been thought necessary nor proper to raise the question here—whether or not either the Eastern or the Western provisional “Order of Worship” should still be used, if desired. The topics here discussed are too broad and catholic to admit of any argument on what is an entirely separate question, one that can be safely left to the future for an answer, and meanwhile to the free judgment of pastors and people.

Berlin, Pa., Feb. 7th, 1894.

III.

HAS THE THEORY OF PLENARY INSPIRATION BEEN INVALIDATED BY THE LATEST IN- VESTIGATIONS OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM?

BY REV. MAURICE G. HANSEN.

THE inquiry opens up a field of discussion the vastness of which must be conceded on account of, even as it is owing to, (1) the existence of doubts upon the subject which that inquiry concerns, extensively prevalent and clamorously aggressive in the expression of them; (2) the marvelous activity of the spirit of research; (3) the suspicion that the criticism of which the Bible is the object, is pursued rather with the aim of weakening confidence in its credibility—and hence its value for practical life—than with that of strengthening the ground upon which its authenticity, and hence its authoritativeness in reference to the most momentous utterances that can be addressed to the human race in its state of moral deflection, guilt and condemnation, may be acknowledged; and finally, (4) the conviction that the Bible as we have it, a message from the Father in heaven to His children on earth, from the God of all grace to His rational creatures imperiled by sin for eternity, is a treasure so incomprehensibly great that too much care cannot be taken for its preservation; too many safeguards cannot be thrown around it for its protection; too much labor cannot be devoted to the effort to secure it intact for the instruction, the guidance and the comfort of the remotest generations. "There never was a time," the Rev. Dr. Archibald Alexander remarked in the preface to his work on the Canon, "when the friends of the Bible as an inspired volume

had a more important duty to perform in its defense than the present (A.D. 1851). The assaults upon the plenary inspiration of the sacred Scriptures are perhaps more dangerous because more plausible and insidious than when divine inspiration is openly denied. On this subject the friends of revelation must be firm and not yield an inch of the ground hitherto occupied by the orthodox. 'If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?' If there were reasons for such an alarm-cry then, what are they not now, forty-three years later, when the assaults are more dangerous still, because more plausible and insidious than ever! In the treatment of our topic we propose, in the first place, to present the definitions of the theory of plenary inspiration that are given, not only by its friends, but also by its foes; and, also, the titles applied to it in the way, respectively, of designation and derision.

The book which, on the two-fold ground of its origin and its *raison d'être*, is called, in distinction from all other books, the Bible, or the Book, comprises the two Covenants or Testaments, known as the Old and the New, set forth in sixty-six books, written by forty different men, of different countries, at intervals more or less distant during fifteen hundred years. The contents of these books are very diverse, and, relating to history, law, religion and morals, and embracing poetry, prophecy and doctrinal and practical discourses, they cover the whole of man's present necessities and future destiny. For this book, so constructed and containing such things, infallibility, or absolute freedom from error in regard to those matters which it purports to teach, are claimed by all who hold, confess and maintain that these forty men were fully inspired by the Spirit of God to write what they did write; and, of their productions, it is ever to be affirmed, both in reference to the fact or substance, and the method or form of their productions, that they are the fruit of such divine inspiration. This assertion involves the themes of Inspiration in general; Inspiration as distinct from, yet implying, revelation; canonicity, or the stable grounds under, and the reliable result of, the recognition, in reference to any

particular book, of the fact of its having been inspired; and lastly, interpretation, or the exegetical process of the evolution from the Scripture of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. Now these several themes, left behind by the very form of our inquiry, in which already a *theory* of inspiration is mentioned, therefore are not now to be taken up, but they are presumed to be understood when at any time there is an allusion to them in the variously stated conceptions, on the one hand, by the supporters of, and on the other, by the dissenters from, that which is included in the phrase, the theory of plenary inspiration. That theory was set forth, soon after the Reformation, in the full enunciation of its substance, rather than by name, since the necessity had not yet arisen of distinguishing it nominally from other propounded theories to be mentioned later. Not to quote the Latin of J. H. Quenstadt, who was an extremist in the entertainment of the plenary inspiration view, it may suffice to reproduce the representation of his idea by Tutor William Lee, of Trinity College, Dublin, in his elaborate work, "The Inspiration of Scripture." Speaking of the system of fixing exclusive attention upon the Divine agency exerted in the composition of the Bible, he says that, according to it, "each particular doctrine or fact, contained in Scripture, whether in all respects naturally and necessarily unknown to the writers, or which, although it might have been ascertained by them in the ordinary course of things, they were not in point of fact acquainted with; or in fine, everything, whether actually known to them or which might become so by means of personal experience or otherwise, each and every such point has not only been committed to writing under the infallible assistance and guidance of God, but is to be ascribed to the special and immediate suggestion, embreathment and dictation of the Holy Ghost. Nor does this hold true merely with respect to the sense of Scripture and the facts and sentiments therein recorded, but each and every word, phrase and expression, as well as the order and arrangement of such words, phrases and expressions, has been separately supplied, breathed into (as it

were) and dictated to the sacred writers by the Spirit of God." This was the view of Calvin, who emphatically proclaimed, in the first book of his "Institutes of the Christian Religion," that the whole of Holy Scripture had no less an Author than God Himself, appealing for confirmation of his assertion to the testimony of the Holy Ghost. Even in our own day this view is said by the late Professor Van Oosterzee to have had able champions in Switzerland in the persons of Gausson and De Gasparin.

If now with this representation of the import of the plenary theory we compare that made by the late Professor Charles Hodge in his great work, "Systematic Theology"—which indeed is a noble monument to his fame—we shall find that the theory does not exclude the human side of the communication of God's revelation to the world, and thus considerably weakens Lee's statement that the theory cannot stand the test of a strict examination. "All the books of Scripture," says Professor Hodge, "are equally inspired. All together are infallible in what they teach. Inspiration extends to all the contents of these several books. It is not confined to moral and religious truths, but extends to the statement of facts, whether scientific, historical, or geographical. It is not confined to those facts the importance of which is obvious, or which are involved in matters of doctrine. It extends to everything which any sacred writer asserts to be true. The inspiration of the Scripture extends to the words. This view is known as the doctrine of plenary inspiration; it denies that inspiration is confined to parts of the Bible, and affirms that it applies to all the books of the sacred Canon. It denies that the sacred writers were merely partially inspired; it asserts that they were fully inspired as to all that they teach, whether of doctrine or fact. It does not imply that the sacred writers were infallible except for the special purpose for which they were employed; that they were imbued with plenary knowledge; that they did not differ among themselves as to insight into the truths which they taught, or that they were free from errors in conduct." In

respect to that feature of the plenary theory, that it claims inspiration also for the language of the Bible, this idea was carried by some in the middle of the eighteenth century, and at the present time also, to the extent that even the vowel-points of the Hebrew Old Testament were directed of God. The followers of Voetius, a celebrated professor of theology in the University of Utrecht, on the orthodox side, "hurled," says Hurst in his *"History of Rationalism,"* "all the curses and plagues of the Bible against every one who whispered that there could be a mistake in the transcription of a word, or even of a Hebrew vowel-point"; and Rev. George S. Bishop, the Vedder lecturer of 1883, in New Brunswick, N. J., strenuously contended for the divine origin of the vowel-points of the original Old Testament Scriptures.

A curious book which recently has interested scholarly lovers of the Bible is entitled, *"Inspiration—a clerical symposium on, In what sense and within what limits is the Bible the Word of God?"* Writers, representing various sections of the Church—Jews and Roman Catholics; Anglicans, Wesleyans and Congregationalists; Unitarians and Swedenborgians, stated on the pages of the *Homiletic Magazine* their convictions in regard to the nature and the degree of the inspiration of the Bible. The several papers were sent forth by the editor of the *Magazine* in book-form, and were published in London. From these we may obtain information concerning the idea which in the present day is entertained of the substance of the theory about which it is asked whether it is now being invalidated. The majority of the authors oppose it, though a few are semi-supporters, or modified endorsers, of it. One of them, the Rev. Preb. Stanley Leathes, appears to have a strong leaning towards it, and consequently draws down upon himself the wrath of the Ven. Archdeacon Farrar whose indignant protest against the theory I shall have occasion to quote a little further on. Dr. Leathes, however, imprudently exposes himself to the sword-thrusts of men of the Robertson Smith school. He had written indeed: "We may rightly say that it is the organic

whole (of the Bible) that is inspired, and not merely the individual parts." But afterwards he delivered himself in this fashion: "The Bible in theological science consists of the original documents, uncopied and untranslated. The Bible of our daily life is the result of many translations of documents repeatedly copied, and, it must be added, somewhat variously copied. It must, therefore, be clearly understood that divine authority cannot be claimed for anything which is not a correct translation of an exact copy of an originally authorized utterance and writing. Here is a wide field for antiquarian research and for scholarly criticism. Whenever these can establish the claim of a various reading, or a revised translation, then the translation, or the reading, must be regarded as having its lawful place in the Word of God." Prof. J. R. Thompson quotes Canon Wilberforce, whose words are in the third volume of his life: "My belief is this: The whole Bible comes to us as the Word of God under the sanction of God the Holy Ghost. We cannot pick and choose amid its contents; all is God's Word to us. A careful scrutiny of the Bible reveals to us the different manners in which the Holy Ghost spoke; sometimes by the mere mechanical use of the human agent who conveyed the message, as when God wrote words on the first tables; dictated them for the second; committed them to prophets simply to repeat, or, spake them through prophets; and sometimes by possessing the human instrument with a complete knowledge of that he was to speak, and leaving him to express it under the mere suggestion and guardianship of His own special presence, and according to the natural use of the human faculties." Prof. Thompson dissents from these views; but still he hangs on to Dr. Leathes' organic whole plan. "The Bible," he says, "is no longer regarded as one book, or consulted in an indiscriminating way as a collection of oracles every word of which is of equal authority with every other. It is rather thought of as an organic product, each part of which has a relation to the other parts; the whole of which was conceived in the divine mind and wrought out gradually through long centuries." The

Rev. Page Hopps is a Unitarian. "Some hold," he wrote, "that the Bible is altogether a supernatural book, and all alike the Word of God." As if to help us in our inquiry what the theory of plenary inspiration claims for itself, even in the opinion of those who in *toto* reject it, he asks: "What is inspiration?" and he replies to his own question in this manner: "The hitherto accepted view is that it is the Scriptural or miraculous influencing of certain chosen persons to enable them to transmit an infallible message from God—these persons being limited to the men who wrote the Bible." Of the paper of Rev. Edward White, a pastor in London, and an author of some note, Archdeacon Farrar affirms that it is the ablest and clearest of them all, this high eulogy being drawn out by the fact that upon the topic of the symposium the two men are in full sympathy of opinion, and that Mr. White seems to have given the Archdeacon a text upon which the latter descants with all the brightness of imagination and the flow of language which render his "Life of Christ," his "Early Days of Christianity," and his "Seekers after God" such attractive reading. "The ecclesiastical idea of the Bible," says Mr. White, "is that it is one book consisting of many parts, each of which has received the sanction of the Church in the earlier Christian ages, as authentic and divinely inspired; so that the whole Hebrew and Greek Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is alike and equally the Word of God. Each writer is a mere pen of the omniscient Spirit, by whom he was preserved from every minute mistake or partial representation. . . . The ecclesiastical Canonists content themselves with binding together in one book all the histories, poems, prophecies and dogmatic writings of the men who lived in contact with the Revelation of God during many ages, and with asserting, concerning the whole collection, one simple principle of a direct verbal inspiration." Prof. Israel Abrahams is, as his name indicates, a Jew. Hence his remark applies only to the Old Testament, of which he declares that, "together with the oral tradition, it, in the conception of the Rabbis, is the Word of God and the *whole* Word of God."

The Right Rev. Bishop Weathers, on the contrary, is a Roman Catholic, and he consequently includes in his Bible of the Old and New Testaments, the Apocrypha. "It is not enough," he observes, "to hold that the books of the Old and the New Testaments were in their origin the fruit of human industry, and were adopted by the Church which put the seal of her approbation upon them. Neither is it sufficient to hold that they contain the truths of revelation without any admixture of error. We are required to believe something more, viz., that they have been delivered to the Church as having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and as having God for their author. Catholics believe, therefore, that the Sacred Scriptures are the Word of God; not merely that they contain the Word of God."

Before quoting Archdeacon Farrar, whose words may serve us as a transition to the second part of this paper, in which we wish to present the grounds upon which the plenary inspiration theory is assailed, it may be well to mention the appellations which are attached to that theory, either in the way of honest designation, or in that of scornful derision. Dr. Charles Hodge speaks of it as "the Church-doctrine," in respect to the adoption of which title he is imitated by Rev. Edward White who, as we have seen, calls it "the ecclesiastical theory." The latter, however, not obscurely hints at the bias of his mind in reference to it when he also styles the theory that of "an outward canonic infallibility," and that of "a uniformly verbal theopneustra." To Canon Wilberforce it is the "orthodox," and the "verbal" theory; Dr. Charles Hodge also employing the same descriptive adjectives. Prof. Abrahams calls it the theory of a direct divine inspiration. Prof. George Hill who, forty years ago, lectured on theology in St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, in his Work on "Divinity," speaks of it as the theory of "inspiration of suggestion and direction," and the late Prof. Van Oosterzee, in his "Christian Dogmatics," with the comprehensive terseness of expressing a great deal in a few words, for which he was remarkable, distinguishes the theory of plenary inspiration

as that of an inspiration which is "absolutely unlimited." And now let us listen to Archdeacon Farrar, as he delivered himself in the *Homiletic Magazine*: "When the general phrase—Word of God, as applied to the Bible—is pressed into the superstitious (I had almost said the fetish-worshipping) dogma that every word and letter of these sixty-six books proceeded supernaturally from God, and that the sacred writers were (to use one phrase adopted by the supporters of verbal inspiration) 'not only the penmen, but the pens of the Holy Ghost,' that phrase becomes not only unintelligible, but profoundly dangerous. This post-reformation dogma I reject as utterly untenable, the daughter of an unspiritual superstition, and the mother of a casuistical tyranny. To say that every word and substance and letter of Scripture is Divine and supernatural, is a mechanical and useless shibboleth, nay more, a human idol, and (constructively) a dreadful blasphemy." Certainly, this is strong language. If there be any doubt as to whether the latest investigations of Biblical Criticism invalidate the theory of plenary inspiration, there can be none whatever that the latest efforts of sledge-hammer iconoclasm are intended utterly to annihilate it; we say the latest, for that hammer has been wielded with more or less determination ever since the days of Prof. Semler, whom Hurst calls "the father of the destructive school of rationalism," and who proved himself a singularly pious man in practical life, in spite of the boldness of his mind's attitude toward the Holy Volume.

Our inquiry into the objections which Biblical Criticism has raised against the theory of plenary inspiration, results indeed in the discovery that they are numerous, but not that they are unanswerable, even though the supporters of that theory are said to be compelled, by the difficulties they encounter, to resort to evasions of the kind proposed by Păguinus, whom Archdeacon Farrar quotes: "*Quicquid in sermone divine neque ad piorum honestatem, neque ad fidei veritatem proprie referri potest, figuratum esse cognoscas*,"—whatever in the word of God cannot properly be referred to the honor of the devout, nor to the truth

of the faith, thou must recognize as figurative." Probably not one of these objections would be excluded by those who entertain them from the results of the investigations to which the question at the head of this paper alludes. Hence they may appropriately be noticed here. But, if we be reminded that that inquiry qualifies the term "investigations" by the adjective "latest," it may well be asked, Where shall the line between earliest and latest be drawn? A somewhat comprehensive statement of these objections, therefore, may not be amiss, especially in preparation for the appreciation of what we propose to advance in description of the substitutes that are offered for a theory which so many are disposed instantly to consign to *limbo patrum*. The grounds upon which the theory is rejected are:

1. Its superfluity, because "some parts of the Bible relate to common things—to those which might have been known from other sources, hence the absurdity of the introduction of a revelation when the bodily senses and natural reason were fully adequate for the purpose."

2. The ephemeral character of a large part of the Bible, which treats of the local and the temporary, between which and the permanent and eternal a distinction should certainly be made. The German rationalist Baur goes further, in the statement that the Bible was written for a time-serving end, namely, that of harmonizing, during the second century, the Pauline and Petrine parties, and that it is undeserving of the value we attach to it. According to Pastor Ulich, the leader of the Protestant Friends of Light in 1841, the Scriptures are very good in their way. They are a witness for the faith of the first times; but they never were intended for these cultivated days.

3. The Bible is full of repetitions, as for instance, the records of the words and the acts of our Saviour, and the accounts of the conversion of Saul, afterwards named Paul. Prof. Thompson says in the "Symposium" that he wishes the space taken up by such repetitions had been filled up with matter not now given. Sherer, the leader of the liberal Protestant Union in

France, finds fault on the ground that there is no exactness in these repeated accounts, since they are described in different contexts and words. "What right have we," he asks, "to accept as infallible that in which we find such admixture of error?" Even in the Old Testament this repetition with a variation of wording is found, as, for example, David's poetical composition, in 2 Sam. 22, reproduced in the Psalms.

4. The Bible contains parts of little interest to sinners of the Gentiles, as for instance, sections of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the whole of the Apocalypse. A far lower degree of inspiration, if any at all, must be attributed to them. Prof. Thompson, also, with reference to the distinction between revelation and inspiration, sees none of the former in the Books of the Chronicles and the Proverbs; but a degree of the latter than which that required for the production of the Psalms and the prophecies is much superior.

5. The Bible is full of errors of fact, of chronology and of numbers.

6. The unsettled state of the Canon which, as is claimed by the opponents of the theory of plenary inspiration, can be accounted for thus: (1) The conception of a homogeneous verbal inspiration, as attending to each and all of the Books of the Bible, is an ecclesiastical opinion not resting on any inspired authority. (2) There are decided internal evidences of the uninspired character of Ezekiel and Ecclesiastes, the former being found in total disagreement with the Pentateuch, and the latter to contain glaring contradictions. (3) The different Books are composite, progressive, of unequal value, and of a fragmentary and multifarious character, and the idea of revelation most complex. Hence a difference of opinion constantly as to what Books shall finally be received into, and complete, the Canon.

7. Evident interpolations, the discovery of which weakens confidence in the genuineness of the rest of the contents of a book in which they are found.

8. Faults of style and of grammar, even in the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Guizot dwells upon them in his

Meditations on the Essence of Christianity, adducing in support of his position the examples solicited by him from Prof. Munk, and also, as respects New Testament Greek, from the author's own son; which examples, however, are set aside and disproved by the late Prof. Tayler Lewis in a learned essay that has been bound up by the American publishers of Guizot's work with his volumes.

9. The Bible contains many difficulties—scientific, ethical, historical, and doctrinal. Each of these four classes is emphasized by the opponents of the plenary theory; but special stress is laid upon the second class, viz., the moral, since the Bible, it is claimed, attributes dark and cruel things to God, or as having been done at His instigation.

10. Several parts of the Bible are obscure and inexplicable, say the critics of the race of Abraham, "notwithstanding the light shed upon them by the inspired oral tradition." These also object to the anthropomorphisms mentioned in the Bible. "In what sense," they ask, "can that be the Word of God which represents Him as seeing and hearing, as possessed of hands, as forming resolutions, and then repenting of his determination?"

11. Both the Old Testament and the New contain accounts of miracles. These, singly and collectively, constitute *ὁ σταυρὸς φιλοσοφῶν*, *crux theologorum*, the cross of the advanced thinkers, as they consider themselves. The denial of the possibility of such wonder-works, and, of course, the rejection of the narratives as truthful records, is the condemnation, *in toto*, of the Bible as an infallible testimony. The theory of plenary inspiration is not opposed more decidedly and positively on any other ground.

12. As a reward of the indefatigable labors in the department of what is styled "higher criticism," it has been discovered that Moses was not the author of the first five Books of the Bible that bear his name; and also, that these and the Book of Joshua, which, with them, compose the hexateuch, belong not even to the period of the great legislator and his successor, the

valiant Captain of Israel, but they are post-exilic, their existence not dating back to a time anterior to the year 800 B. C. If the Bible be viewed as a column resting upon a base, the destructive criticism directed against the five Books of Moses and that of Joshua, is the attempt at the removal of this base, leaving the column without any support, suspended, like Mahomet's coffin, in mid-air. Prof. Godwin, in his article entitled, "The Mosaic Cosmogony," in the notorious *Essays and Reviews*, published a little more than a quarter of a century ago, declares that the writer of the opening chapters of the Book of Genesis, "had no authority whatever for what he asserts so solemnly and unhesitatingly, since he was merely a speculator who stated as facts what he only conjectured as probabilities." The framers of the system of what is called "Modern Theology," of whom, in the Netherlands, Pierson was one of the leaders, with the principle "no authority," announced that the Books of the Bible were produced neither by the supposed authors, nor at the alleged dates. This was the manner of the foe's approach, not more than a decade since, toward the fortress over which floats the flag of plenary inspiration. At about the period of the *Essays and Reviews*, the theological world, yes, we may say, the Christian world, was startled by the utterances that sounded across the seas from the shores of Africa. Bishop Colenso, aiming to fix the real origin, age and authorship of the so-called narratives of Moses and Joshua, sought to overthrow the historical character of the early Scriptural history, by exposing the contradictions and impossibilities contained therein. The bald assertions that are found in the compositions of the followers of Eichhorn, Strauss, Rénan and Colenso, are succeeded by the scholarly critique of such men as Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Robertson Smith whose twelve lectures on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church are exceedingly instructive and interesting. Although the works of these men are most scholarly, they are not the less to be carefully watched. The sharp spikes which the Zulus fix in the ground and then cover with green leaves and forest flowers,

are most likely, for this latter fact, to pierce the feet of the soldiers who fail to be on their guard against the enemy's skill and cunning. The course of criticism relating to the Hexateuch is briefly traced by the editor of the defensive essays, furnished by professors in the theological seminaries of various Protestant denominations throughout the country, and published under the name, "Moses and his Recent Critics." From this retrospect of the Higher Criticism applied to the first six Books of Scripture, which began about the middle of the eighteenth century, we learn that then Astruc, a learned physician, who still admitted that Moses was the author of the Books from Genesis to Deuteronomy, suggested the idea that they were composed from older documents which he denominated the Elohistie and the Jehovistic. The wedge then inserted subsequently received the force of very ponderous blows, and the opening constantly became wider. In 1800, Geddes declared that the Pentateuch is composed of fragments which have no logical nor chronological connection. This opinion was accepted and elaborated by Hartman in 1831. Seven years afterwards Tuch revived the original Elohistie-document plan; but he differed somewhat from Astruc in that he stated that a Jehovistic writer made additions to the document which he found prepared to his hand. Just a century after the last-named critic, that is, in 1853, Hupfield announced that not two, but three continuous historical compositions lie at the base of the Pentateuch: two Elohistie and one Jehovistic—which by a later editor were combined into a connected account. In 1861 Knobel said that the Jehovistic writer drew his information from a sub-source, a document entitled "Das Rechtbuch und das Kriegebuch," that is, a judicial code and a set of military annals. During the following year Prof. Kuenen, of the University of Leyden, who, in respect to the methods of the Higher Criticism may be regarded as Colenso's twin brother, undertook to show that the precise details of the history in the Books of Moses and Joshua are the least consistent with the laws of possibility; and, at the same time, Popper,

a Jew, arguing from the divergencies by which the Samaritan and the LXX. texts are distinguished from the Massoretic, declared that the legislation concerning the building of the tabernacle and the consecration of the priests, did not take its present shape until long after the exile. In his opinion the original document was the result of a lengthy revision which received its finishing touches from the Scribes who succeeded Ezra. Finally, Graff, in 1866, promptly took the whole of the first Elohist, history as well as laws, out of the Mosaic period, and transferred them to an age, more or less sharply defined, following the restoration of the tribes of Judah from the Babylonish captivity. The contemplation of the wisdom that discerned the various documents, written by other men than Moses, and centuries after the conflict over his body in a locality unknown to mortal man; documents designated by the letters J, E, D and P, and documents designated by the combinations of these letters, quite takes away our breath. How strange that our Lord should so often have referred to Moses by name, as the speaker, or the writer, of the words which He, the Divine Teacher, saw occasion to quote from the Old Testament Scripture! What a dreadful mistake Abraham in glory made, when he informed Dives in torment that his brothers still on earth had Moses and the prophets!

The inquiry which we are discussing so far having been considered in the way of a statement of that which the theory of the plenary inspiration of the Bible comprises, and also of the grounds upon which it has been, and is, assailed, has an answer to it attempted in the way of a presentation of the substitutes that are offered for it. If but one of these be a satisfactory one, then the reply may be, without any circumlocution, categorically in the affirmative. If not, then for the glory of the condescending Revealer, and for the sake of the race dead in trespasses and sin, the negative response cannot be too pronounced. In mentioning these substitutionary theories we, in every instance but two, devised for it a name by which it possibly may be designated. We begin, then, with what I call the

semi-theistic theory. It holds a middle position between the non-inspiration view of the deist, and the all-inspiration opinion of the orthodox. The revelation which it admits it confines to the sphere of human knowledge. The greatest stress it lays in that revelation on the thought of man, and hence it is utterly inadequate, since the highest culture and development even can produce nothing more than what is human in a condition of need which calls for nothing less than the divine.

Of the *philosopho-religious self-productive* theory the celebrated Schleiermacher was the originator. It claims that there is nothing in the Old Testament which the Adamic nature was not adequate to produce; nothing in the New Testament which Christianity, the life of the Church, a life common to all believers, is not sufficient to account for. Morell expounded this theory in his "Philosophy of Religion." He says: "Revelation is a process of the intuitional consciousness gazing upon eternal verities. Revelation and inspiration indicate one united process, the result of which upon the human mind is to produce a state of spiritual intuition whose phenomena are so extraordinary, that we at once separate the agency by which they are produced from any of the ordinary principles of human development. . . . Inspiration indicates the elevation of the religious consciousness, and with it, of course, the power of spiritual vision to a degree of intensity peculiar to the individuals thus highly favored of God. . . . The Bible cannot, in strict accuracy of language, be termed a revelation, since a revelation always implies an actual process of intelligence in a living mind; but it contains the records in which those minds who enjoyed the preliminary training, or the first brighter revelations of Christianity, have described the scenes which awakened their own religious nature to a new life, and the high ideas and aspirations to which that new life gave origin." This theory, attractive no doubt to the contemplative and less practical mystic, does not allow to the Bible a nominal authority as a rule of faith. Regarded as containing only the thoughts of even holy men, the forms in which their understandings without super-

natural aid clothed the intuitions due to their religious feelings, the Bible must necessarily lack the perfectness of which not even the holiest man is possessed, hence also infallibility; and therefore it cannot but be an unreliable guide out of the labyrinths of error and guilt unto the open fields of truth and purity.

Somewhat akin to Schleiermacher's theory is that of the *ordinary spiritual influence*. The sacred writers, as the supporters of this third substitute teach, were under the guidance of an influence such as is common to every believer. The parts of the Bible which contain no special revelations are to be regarded as the devotional writings, or the historical narratives, of devout but fallible men. This theory was endorsed and maintained by the Rev. F. D. Maurice in his *Theological Essays*. He required that "we must forego the demand which we make on the conscience of young men when we compel them to declare that they regard the inspiration of the Bible as generally unlike that which God bestows on His children in His day." This theory, though it indeed exalts the person who is a subject of the operation of sanctifying grace, fails to make a proper distinction between those whom God chose to be His messengers, His prophets, His spokesmen, and other men. If the writings of such an one even as Thomas à Kempis, or Bunyan; if the imitable "*Imitation of Christ*," or "*Pilgrim's Progress*," are as authoritative as any part of, or the whole Bible, then, either there is no Canon, or rule of faith or practice at all, or the Canon is not now completed, and never will be until the last pious man has ceased to talk or write.

The *limited inspiration theory* has a variety of representatives according as the restrictions affect the writers of the several Books of the Scripture, of whom only those from whom the Law and the Prophecies proceeded are regarded as supernaturally guided by the Spirit; or, as they affect the two great divisions themselves of the Bible, the New Testament being deemed inspired to an extent that the Old Testament was not inspired; or, as they affect the teachings contained in the entire Scripture, those only of a doctrinal character being held as

inspired; or, finally, as they affect the method of revelation, inspiration, though affirmed of the thought, yet being denied of the language in which it is expressed. This limitation theory is unsatisfactory, on the very face of it, on the ground that there positively cannot be any authoritative decision as to who shall make, in the Bible, the selection between the inspired and the uninspired. "Who," asks Guizot, in his *Meditations*, "shall mark the limit of the inspiration? Who shall say which texts, which passages, are inspired and which are not? So to divide the Holy Scriptures, is to strip them of their supernatural character, and to destroy their authenticity by surrendering them to all the incertitudes and all the disputes of men. A complete and uninterrupted inspiration alone is capable of commanding faith."

The climactic theory is based on the principle of degrees of inspiration. On the lowest step of the ladder lie the hagiographa; at the middle, the Prophets; on the top, the Law. According to that theory, the writers of the Books of Kings and Chronicles needed and received less of theopneustia than the Prophet Isaiah or the Evangelist John. From the famous Rabbi Maimonides down to the saintly Doddridge, this theory has been sustained by names ponderous because of learning, piety, or consecration. Possibly, in the opinion of some it does not oppose the plenary theory; nevertheless, it certainly is a departure from it. If authoritativeness depend wholly on inspiration, then the introduction into the recognition of the latter of the element of measurement is at least the exposure of the former to detraction, which, in respect to such a book as the Bible, is perilous.

The all-penetrating theory makes no distinction between inspiration and genius. They who advance it insist that Milton and Pitt, Bunyan and Keble, were inspired, not to a higher degree, certainly; not to a lower degree, certainly; not differently than, as well as, Moses and David, Jeremiah and Paul. Extraordinary poets, statesmen, artists, are divinely inspired within the spheres in which they are prominent. So, also, are

the producers of the histories, the prophecies, the doctrines, contained in the Bible. Such a theory lifts the Koran, or the Zendavesta, up to the Bible, or it lowers the Bible down to such magnificent works even as Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," or the Dialogues of Plato.

The translucent theory needs only be named in order to remind us of its Swedenborgian origin. "The Word of the Lord," says the Rev. W. C. Barlow, in the Symposium, "is not a written book, but the presence among men of the Spirit of Jehovah." In his essay he attempts to show that the translucent revelation rests upon an anterior obscure revelation; aims at intelligibility; is necessarily imperfect, and cannot be final. "To this class of revealed things belong the Pauline and other Epistles, and probably also the Acts of the Apostles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and *perhaps* other books contained in the Bible. . . . Other revelation than this is contained in the Bible. . . . As the *Works* of God are to our highest scientific treatises, so is the *Word* of God (if this be discoverable), to the Apostolic Word or other translucent revelation. . . . We have, besides the Apostolic Word and its kindred books in the Old Testament, a series of books which constitute the veritable Word of God, namely, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, the Psalms, the Prophets, the Gospels and the Revelation. To these add connective and confirmatory histories, as Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, with Job and the Song of Solomon, dramatic works which are in part at least imitative of the style of the Word. The Word itself stands out from all these, even from the inspired Apostolic Word." To those who succeed in catching the author's meaning, his ratiocination perhaps furnishes a curious example of the effort to combine with the climactic theory of inspiration the Swedenborgian doctrine of correspondences.

The subjective theory, in one form of it, holds that inspiration belongs to the sphere of the natural intelligence, and thus it is akin to the all-penetrating theory; in another form of it, it holds that inspiration belongs to the sphere of the spiritual,

and consists in the gracious influence of God acting upon the religious consciousness, thus being akin to the spiritual influence theory; in still a third form of it, in respect to which, indeed, it is distinctive, it holds that *that* is inspired which *finds* a man. But what in man does it find? Semler said, "Reason." Says Hurst, in his History of Rationalism, "He decided the proof of the inspiration of a book to be the inward conviction of our mind that what it conveys to us is truth. In this way he concluded some books of the Old Testament must be rejected, some accounted doubtful, some produced by gifted men, some to be filled with legends, some to be positively injurious, some to be the work of wild fanatics." Nearly a century elapsed, and the gifted Coleridge taught that what must be found in man, unto the detection in the Bible of that which is inspired, is the religious consciousness. In his "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," he says: "Whatever finds me bears witness for itself that it has proceeded from the Holy Spirit, even from the same Spirit which, remaining in itself, yet regenerateth all other powers, and, in all ages entering into holy souls, maketh them friends of God and prophets. . . . As much of reality, as much of objective truth, as the Scriptures communicate to the subjective experiences of the believer, so much of present life, of living and effective import do these experiences give to the letter of these Scriptures." In an article in the *Prieston Review*, of September, 1881, the subjective theory is ably discussed by Prof. Charles Elliott, of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Chicago. He shows: *That* the application, to inspiration, of the third-mentioned form of the subjective theory, is a *petitio principii*, since it requires that a reader of the Bible must be inspired to prove the inspiration of the Bible; *that* the proof derived from it is vague, since the religious consciousness is a variable quantity; *that* it leads to the conclusion that one portion of the Bible may be inspired to one man, and not inspired to another; and *that* it takes away all authority from the Bible as regards the unbelieving and the impenitent who have no religious consciousness at all, or that which is very feeble.

Finally, what kind of Bible, for the Bible that is precious to the plenary inspiration theorists, is offered by the practitioners of what Eichhorn called "the higher criticism" which, in the language of the Rev. T. W. Chambers, the editor of "Moses and his Recent Critics," "does not mean, as sometimes has been supposed, something superior in nature and methods to other criticism, but simply that, pre-supposing the precise text of any book and the exegesis of its language as already settled, it goes on to examine its integrity and authorship, the mutual relation of its parts, and its literary features as a whole." The dissertations which are the fruits of the application of this criticism, doubtless are valuable in the two-fold respect of instructiveness, and hence also, of attractiveness; but is there not some resemblance between these fruits and the fabled apples of Sodom, which are beautiful without, but within yielded ashes to the teeth and bitterness to the tongue? These higher critics, by means of their patient analyses and minute comparisons of one part of the Hebrew Scriptures with another, have brought out with greater clearness what was suspected as long as any part of the Scriptures existed, namely, that there are difficulties in them which vanish only before a knowledge that is full, and a power that can solve all mysteries. The higher critics too often perform the part of Alexander of Macedon when he, instead of disentangling the knot in the rope attached to the chariot at Gordium, cut it through with one blow of his sword. The conqueror, indeed, soon after verified the oracle's dictum by adding Egypt to his fast-growing empire; but, we ask, what triumphs are achieved as the results of the summary proceedings of the Higher Critics? Professor Israel E. Dwinell, in "Moses and his Recent Critics," divides the Higher Criticism into the primary and the secondary. Of the former he says, in an essay which cannot be commended too highly, that it is "destructive and its method unscientific"; of the latter, that it is "more plausible and dangerous" than the other, but "less consistent and logical." His points are: *that* it develops distrust of Scripture and a critical spirit; *that* it slights the principle of

authorship and destroys the realism of Scriptural history; *that* it gives no satisfactory account of the origin of the religion and history of Israel; *that* it discredits the revelation of God by a historical process, and rejects the natural order of the development of religion; *that* it dishonors the prophets and discredits Christ and the writers of the New Testament; *that* it makes Biblical theology unsatisfactory and worthless, impeaches the whole doctrine of inspiration, and gives a spent Bible. The expression "a spent Bible," the fruit of the Higher Criticism, is similar to that from the pen of Herder who, after observing that the critical labors of the rationalists are like the squeezing of a lemon, remarks: "The Bible that they would give is nothing but a juiceless rind."

Have the latest, have *any* of the investigations of Biblical criticism invalidated the theory of plenary inspiration? No, certainly not yet, nor will any future criticism invalidate it, so long as the results are not different from those that so far are offered, and are applied in the reconstruction of a Bible from which the foundation of a divine origin, as to *every* part of it, has been removed. We prefer to cling to the plenary inspiration theory until another has been devised which may account more logically, more clearly philosophically, more devoutly for an influence which *ὁ Βιβλος*, the Book, is exerting upon the world to reclaim it, upon the family to sanctify it, upon the individual to instruct, guide, comfort, and fit for heaven. There are two sayings of Dr. Leathes, in the Symposium, with which we are in full accord: "If we cannot trust the *ipsissima verba* of the divine writings when we most stand in need of learning the divine will, what is there that we can trust?" And again: "The argument that leads to *any* Bible leads to a *full* Bible." Nor, in thus declaring our unhesitating adherence to the theory of inspiration which we cannot think has yet been successfully assailed, can we be thought disqualified for the entertainment of an appreciative regard for the utterances of the late lamented Professor Van Oosterzee, in his "Christian Dogmatics." He claims that the two conceptions of *Holy Scripture* and *Word of*

God must be, on the one hand, duly distinguished; on the other, presented in their higher unity and their proper connection. The fifteenth proposition which he adduces in the discussion of the whole theme of inspiration is this: "As Holy Scripture, on the one hand, contains the Word of God,—i. e., the Divine Revelation—so may Scripture itself, on the other hand, in its totality, be termed the Word of God, as the consequence of the theopneustia of its writers." Possibly this postulate, in the bare statement of it, is objectionable to the supporter of the plenary theory. But its purport, as it lay in the author's mind, he himself has made plain. "The fruitless controversy," he says, "as to whether the Bible is God's Word, or whether it only *contains* it, is well known. Whereas formerly both propositions were identified and sometimes confused, in later times an accurate distinction has been demanded with increasing emphasis. . . . Only on both sides there is need for caution, lest the two sides of the same thing should be opposed to each other as in irreconcilable contrast. The statement '*the Bible is God's Word*' brings into the foreground the higher unity of Holy Scripture; the counter statement, '*the Bible contains God's Word*,' brings into the foreground its manifest diversity. It *contains* the Word of God, because it is the record of that which God has spoken to man, as well in *deed* as in *word*; it is, taken in its entirety, God's word, because it is notably the work of one Spirit which in different measure animated the inspired writers, and which is the higher bond even between the most different parts. But the formula, '*the Bible is God's Word*,' must never be taken in such a way as to mean that every single word in the Bible is a word of God in the proper sense of the expression. Words of men, yea, of devils as well as of God, are to be read in the Bible, although certainly written under divine guidance. All in the Bible which is plainly seen to be a constituent part of divine revelation, is God's Word; and again, the Bible itself is God's Word, because, and in so far as, the Spirit of God here addresses us as nowhere else. Both statements are thus true when they are allowed to

stand side by side; but they cease to be the pure and just expression of the truth as soon as they are opposed to each other."

Do we retain and maintain the theory of plenary inspiration? Do we fail to perceive in any one of the substituted theories the evidence of a solidity which we should look for as the base upon which is to rest our confidence in an infallible, hence a reliable rule of faith and practice? Do we grieve to see the Bible so lightly tossed from one critic's hands into those of another? Do we lack sympathy with that so-called spirit of progress which claims to be abreast of the times by joining in the privately expressed (which is bad enough) and publicly announced (even in the course of clerical ministration from the pulpit, which is infinitely worse) strictures upon the genuineness, the authenticity, the veracity, of parts of the books, or of entire books of the Bible? Then we are among those whom Williams, one of the contributors to the notorious "Essays and Reviews," called "the well-meaning crowd for whom grave compassion is to be manifested," and whom Robertson Smith, in the first lecture on the Jewish Church in the Old Testament, more politely designates as "the timid people." "Timid people?" Ah, yes. Across the path of my soul's life there is a chasm of a fathomless depth. An all-pitying Being laid over it a bridge, employing in the construction of it, under his special superintendence, a chosen number of his servants. Scores, hundreds, thousands, have tried it, and by means of it have safely reached the yonder side. Just now you and I who also must find our way across the abyss, see persons approaching the bridge from all directions. They carry saws, planes, hammers. With these they are working away at the solid timbers. Terror-stricken, we exclaim, What are you doing? They answer, "We are experts at bridge-making. We will take away its props and give you better. We will remodel the structure and improve it. We will"—"Hold!" we reply to them, "Let it alone. We dare you to touch it!" Are we timid? It is the timidity that saves our lives. In an article in the *Princeton Review*, for October, 1857, says the anonymous

writer: "Happily the belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures is so connected with faith in Christ, that the latter in a measure necessitates the former. A man can hardly believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and worship Him as such, without regarding as the Word the volume which reveals His glory; which treats of His person and work, from its first page to its last sentence; which predicted His advent four thousand years before His manifestation in the flesh; which centuries before His birth described His glory as though it was an object of sight, and His life and death as though they had already occurred. . . . When a man becomes a true Christian, when he is made a partaker of the precious faith of God's elect, what is it that he believes? The Scriptural answer to that question is, He believes the record which God has given of His Son. And where is that record? In every part of the Bible directly or indirectly, from Genesis to Revelation. Faith therefore in Christ, involves faith in the Scriptures, as the Word of God, and faith in the Scriptures as the Word of God, is faith in their plenary inspiration." To this we say Amen, adding that it is a sad day when the idea is entertained that such respect for the Bible is sheer Bibliolatry, since that volume is not so sacred as to be exempt from criticism.

"How precious is the book divine,
By inspiration given;
Bright as a lamp its doctrines shine
To guide our souls to heaven."

IV.

THE OBJECTIVE MEANS OF GRACE, AND RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS.

BY REV. S. Z. BRAM, D.D.

THE religious activity of our time appears to surpass that of any previous period of the Christian era; not even excepting the Apostolic era. It is also true that an anti-religious activity characterizes the times, and that some of the most gigantic intellects of this pre-eminently intellectual period have arrayed themselves, not only against Christianity, but against Theism itself. With such men, strenuous efforts have been made to account for the existence and phenomena of the universe, without a designing mind, a creating hand, or a controlling providence. But, aside from this self-conscious and intentional effort to rid the human race of its God, and to extirpate a divine religion, there is an anti-religious element pervading all the spheres of human activity, of which most people seem to be wholly unconscious. The tendency is in the direction of secularism and materialism. And so strong is the tendency, that many of our Christian people are borne along with the current, and are therefore, without any such intention, arrayed on the side of an irreligious and anti-Christian secularism, which is largely responsible for the financial and commercial depression that has settled upon all the peoples of the world. And this tendency appears to be working itself out, more particularly, among the English-speaking peoples, perhaps, because they are more radically progressive in material advancement than others. This materialistic disposition of the American people was remarked by speakers at the Parliament of Religions held at

Chicago, who sailed from far-away India. That the charge is true, appears abundantly evident from the teachings of so-called Reformers. In their public utterances, few of them recognize God or Christianity. Socialism, Political Economy, Reconciliation of Capital and Labor, are discussed in all their relations, correspondencies and antagonisms, but, almost universally, from a political, secular or commercial stand-point, without any reference to, or regard for, religion. As if the moral, spiritual nature of man were entirely *nil*, as compared with his physical and intellectual enjoyment! Yet many of these "Reformers" are professedly Christians! But it is clear that no satisfactory solution of these great problems can ever be reached, until Christian people fully assert their Christian character, and Christian writers call to their aid the principles of Christianity, and allow them their legitimate position, as the controlling influence in adjusting the relations of men to men, in all spheres of life. As soon as this God-given religion is permitted to exert its ameliorating influence on the strugglers in these conflicts the strife will come to an end, and the Golden Rule of the blessed Master will be recognized as the true law of human life. And then the competition among men will take the form of an effort to excel each other in their conformity to its requirements. Then will dawn the longed-for golden age, when there will be peace on earth and good will among men.

But yet, notwithstanding the evils just pointed out, the proposition with which this paper is introduced, holds literally true.

The different Churches of Christendom are waking up, more and more, to a full appreciation of the responsibility imposed upon them by the great commission of the exalted and glorified Christ. Accordingly, wherever we look, we see, without much effort, the forces of Christianity bracing themselves in one form or another, and uniting against the power of darkness, against secularism, against wrongly applied world-powers, against spiritual wickedness in high places (Eph. 6: 12). The forces

of the Gentiles (Isa. 60) which have become evangelized, are fighting under the banner of the cross. The sacramental hosts of the Lord are consecrating themselves, and much of their wealth, to the spread of the Gospel in Christian lands, and are lifting up the banner of Christ, over the lands yet held in the toils of idolatry, and groping in the darkness of false religions. In our own land the waste places are receiving increased attention, and new congregations are springing up, and new churches built, as rapidly as men can be found to occupy the vacant fields. Our own Church, once likened to "a sleeping giant," has risen up from its supposed slumbers, and is manifesting increasing activity and energy in all directions. The older and larger colleges are advancing with enlarged endowments; the theological seminaries are becoming strongly manned; and college and seminary buildings are in course of erection, all of which bear testimony to the intellectual elevation and growing beneficence of our people. The Missionary and Sunday-school Boards have also taken advanced steps and active measures to push forward the work in their respective fields of operation.

But in addition to these evidences of progress, afforded through the regular channels of church work, new forces and energies are coming into action, which, hitherto, in the Reformed Church, have not been called out, at least in the same effective and aggressive way. Societies for the training of our hitherto unused energies at home, and for the propagation of our holy religion abroad, are springing up in every quarter, with a rapidity commensurate with the swiftly moving current of material progress, so that one hazards little in predicting the universal prevalence of special organizations among the Churches, for evangelical work and advancement, at the opening of the twentieth Christian century, about to dawn upon the world.

The progress of such organizations, however, even of missionary societies, has not been uniformly smooth or easy. It has not met that prompt and cordial reception, universally in our

Church, that it has apparently met in sister denominations. The Women's Missionary Societies have had to encounter and overcome a good deal of honest conscientious opposition. But this is gradually and surely giving way, and the societies are rapidly gaining ground.

The same holds true of "Mission Bands," "King's Daughters," "Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavor," and "Brotherhoods of Andrew and Philip," and all other similar organizations. They have been compelled to struggle into existence, against obstructions and antagonisms which would have been sufficient in any age of less earnest determination, if not entirely to interdict, at least to greatly impede and retard their advancing progress. But the impetuosity with which these movements are hastening forward bids defiance to all opposition.

Yet it is not strange, that the conservatism of a Church like ours, so fully committed to what is known as the Educational System of religion, and so tenacious of its high ideal of the sacramental energies of grace, is naturally slow in recognizing and adopting methods and practices, which seem foreign to her spirit, and simply human, in their invention. These time-honored, sacramental methods of Church work are so bound up in her very constitution, and with all that has been held sacred in her history, that the Reformed Church has found it difficult to admit the modern appliances of other systems in her practical work, which seemed in any way to militate against, or to treat with contempt, what she has ever regarded as God-appointed means of grace. God had honored and blessed her well-meant efforts to maintain her position, in the past, amid the strife engendered by the innovations of revivalism, which often assailed her. And the maintenance of her high churchly position involved severe struggles for more than a century in this country, accompanied with much bitterness and strife, and the loss of able ministers and congregations. But now, having settled for herself, at least, the all-important questions at issue, she is naturally jealous of any new movement, that might seem

in any way to threaten a revival of old bitterness and strife, or involve newly-invented methods of foisting upon her in another form, what she has already repudiated, as foreign to her churchly spirit or inimical to her churchly methods.

But it is evident that these new organizations within the Church have come to stay until their purpose is accomplished. They are daily gaining ground. The opposition is visibly weakening from year to year, as any one can see who reads the Church papers, or hears the annual discussions held at the sessions of our Classes and Synods. To the minds of some this is a sign of wonderful and encouraging progress, in which they discern the wonder-working power of God. To others, equally sincere and earnest in the work of the Master, notwithstanding this rapid outward prosperity, it looks like a "stooping to conquer," a menace to the solemn dignity and the reverent use of the objective means of grace, a breaking away from the divinely appointed ordinances, and, in some sense also, a repudiation of the Churchly and Christological stand-point of the creed, and a lowering of the spiritual life to the plane of a mere subjective experience. If this opinion should prove true, if those whose judgment is thus expressed are right, then it is a movement, that ought not only to be deprecated, but resisted with all the energy that our faith, and logic and personal influence can command. For anything that in any particular tends to lower our faith in, and reverence for, the objective and supernatural side of Christianity, must be regarded as inimical to Christ Himself, and therefore also to the true Christian life in us.

But if, on the contrary, these fears should prove to be unfounded, the persons troubled by them are not deserving of condemnation on the part of their "more progressive" brethren, as "old fogies," "cranks," and "ignoramuses." For it must be admitted that those who entertain such fears are among the greatest, most earnest, and most successful workers in the Church. Many of them are prognosticating the spiritual weather of the future by the experience of storms in the past, and are

naturally shy of the possible dangers through which the old ship of Zion may have to pass. There is no doubt of her ability to weather any storms that may beat upon her, as long as the Master is on board. And yet it is natural for conservative brethren to wish her to steer clear of them, and not to sail in waters peculiarly subject to such disturbances. Let no one then assume the responsibility of condemning those brave soldiers of the cross, because they are slow to fall in with "new things" pertaining to our ecclesiastical "machinery." They have good reasons for walking in the "old paths," or keeping the ship in quiet waters, and for exercising a prudent caution, when asked to endorse a movement looking towards new and hitherto untried measures for carrying forward the work of the Church.

Their fears may not be realized. God forbid that they should. We fondly hope that the new methods will be sanctified by the Holy Spirit to the end in view, and that the kingdom of Christ may be greatly advanced through their instrumentality. Much good has already been accomplished by their means. Men and women, young and old, have become consecrated, and are now engaged in the Master's work, who otherwise would probably be counted among the latent energies of the Church, with little or no prospect of ever doing any positive work for Christ or His people. Young men and women are now active in the Church, some in the home, and some in the foreign field of missions, who, but for these movements, might yet be wandering in the highways of sin. Many hearts are now glowing with the love of Christ, and, animated with the spirit of His great commission, are working amid the darkness of heathenism, for the glory of the Master, who might never have felt the joy of pardoned sin, or the peace of God reigning in their hearts, but for the influence brought to bear upon them by these religious societies. From these considerations we believe that the latent energies of the Church are evidently waking up and coming to the front, and that a new and burning zeal for souls is laying hold of the hearts of God's people, and that the numerous organizations, to which reference has been made, are the outcome of a move-

ment which is impelled by the Spirit of God. And our young people, under this impulse, are putting themselves in an attitude in which they are becoming more susceptible to the sanctifying energy of the Spirit of Christ, and so are being "driven" by Him into a consecrated activity, and are thus devoting themselves to the service of Christ. If this is true, it is certainly the work of God. And since God has so signally blessed this movement, and through it given an impetus to the spread of the gospel, such as has never perhaps been witnessed since the introduction of Christianity into the world, it seems eminently proper that we all ought to foster and encourage it.

Now, having said this much, the writer will not be charged with opposition, secret or open, to the organized movements above mentioned. But as all movements among men are more or less subject to dangers and liable to abuse, it is easy to see in this grand movement the possibility, and even the probability, of a falling away from the order of salvation, as this comes to us through the regularly constituted means of grace. God has, indeed, not laid down an iron rule for the conduct of His work among men. He, doubtless, allows room for the adoption of such methods as may be best adapted for the purpose at any given time. And as long as such man-made methods harmonize with His own appointments, He owns and blesses our efforts. But whenever those methods come in conflict with His appointed means of grace, or are substituted for them, or lead us to ignore and set them aside, or treat them as mere outward ceremonies, having a body without a soul, or a form without a life, and then use them, if at all, as only an empty badge of our profession, we have no moral right to expect His blessing on our efforts. And although outward success may be enjoyed, it is not necessarily a sign of God's approval. If mere success were a sign of divine approbation, or a criterion by which to judge of God's favor, some of the worst actions of men might claim to enjoy that distinction. But, on the contrary, a want of outward success is not always a sign of His disapproval. In fact God does not always require us to succeed. He only re-

quires faithful devotion to His service. The success or failure of our efforts we may cheerfully and trustingly leave in His hands. Only we must do the duties assigned us in His appointed way.

But, in any case, the movements under consideration are of an entirely subjective nature, and therefore present a one-sided view of the Christian life, viz., what we do for Christ. The works that we thus do, if done in true faith, are certainly valuable as a test of our faith, and therefore commendable. But they are not to be relied on as works of merit; for in that case they would have to "be absolutely perfect, and in all respects conformable to the divine law; but our best works in this life are all imperfect and defiled by sin" (Heid. Cat., Q. 62). And yet the evident tendency is to keep our gaze so constantly on these subjective good works, that we lose sight of the grace and "Spirit of God, who works faith in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel, and confirms it by the use of the sacraments" (Heid. Cat., Q. 65). And so the objective agency of the Holy Ghost, and the objective means of grace, are robbed of their essential nature, and fall into contempt. Thus as "signs" they become insignificant, and as "seals" they become mere outward badges of discipleship, and no longer "declare and seal to us the promise of the Gospel, that God grants to us freely the remission of sins and life eternal for the sake of that one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross."

"The Holy Ghost teaches us in the Gospel, and assures us by the sacraments, that the whole of our salvation depends upon the sacrifice of Christ, which He offered for us, on the cross" (Heid. Cat., Q. 67). But if we lose sight of these all-important truths, and rely on the effects which they are intended to produce in our lives, for acceptance with God,—as the failings of human nature incline us to do,—we exalt the subjective effects of divine grace, and thereby repudiate the efficacy of the divine means through which this grace is communicated. And if this tendency is allowed to work out its logical results, the evident consequence must follow, viz.: that we save ourselves by our good works and our moral character, and Christ Himself be-

comes to us merely the model man, not the God-Man who saves us, but only the man who sets us a good example, whom it becomes a merit to follow. Then sacramental grace becomes a figment, and the Church a voluntary association of professing Christians for mutual edification and spiritual enjoyment, with which any Christian may dispense without much loss. From this standpoint it is not uncommon to hear remarks like the following: "Baptism is not a saving ordinance;" "The Holy Supper is not a grace-bearing ordinance;" "One can be saved out of the Church, if he lives right;" or "It matters little what he believes, if he does right," as if it were possible to live the Christian life without believing the Christian creed!

Likewise, by a logical consistency, "churchliness" is characterized by the flippant expression, "churchianity." And with a similar levity a play upon the word "Christo-centric," as applied to the creed, has characterized faith in the Church as "the body of Christ," as "churchi-centric." Again, from this low standpoint, it is easy to regard "conversion," as a possibility, and even a necessity, quite independently of the Church, or, indeed, of any means of grace whatever, except those invented and used under the revival system. "Get religion," is the cry, without regard to creed or ordinance, by bombarding the throne of grace immediately, discarding the intervention of priest and ritual as relics of Romanism and superstition. In consistency with this unchurchly spirit, a celebrated itinerant evangelist is reported to have said: "If I thought baptism a saving ordinance I would take a bucket of water, and pass down through the aisles of this church, and sprinkle all the people as I went;" from which it is easy to see that his idea of holy baptism is no better than a caricature, and it must have been formed without any adequate apprehension of the divine mystery of sacramental grace, or of the deep solemnity of this Christ-appointed ordinance. If such a man can get people converted in his own way, he can, apparently, without conscientious scruples, ridicule the means of God's appointment, and set them aside as empty, meaningless ceremonies.

The *ex opere operato* theory is, of course, to be repudiated. We do not pretend to advocate the doctrine that the outward baptism of water is, *per se*, a regenerative act. On the contrary, the mere external washing of water is not the blotting out of sin; "for," as the Catechism beautifully says, "the blood of Jesus Christ only, and the Holy Ghost, cleanse us from all sin" (Q. 72). But this outward symbolical washing is the "divine pledge and sign" by which "He assures us" that our sins are washed away by "the blood and Spirit of Christ." And hence, according to the divinely-inspired command, every one of us is to be "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2: 38). (Of course, genuine repentance must be in order in all cases, without conditions.) And, in full harmony with this sacramental view, we are assured by another inspired writer, that "as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ" (Gal. 3: 27). Along with the use of this objective means of grace there must be also an exercise of faith,—by the individual himself, if the subject is an adult; by the parents, if it is an infant,* and also an humble and complete surrender to Christ, as our only Lord and Saviour. And in addition, there must be a sincere confession of sin, and of our entire dependence on Christ, for the removal of our guilt, and for our reconciliation to God in Him. In this way, through the means of baptism, accompanied with the divine Word, which becomes effectual through the operation of the Holy Ghost, the life-germ of a new creation is implanted within us, and becomes potentially the starting-point in that divine process which culminates in the new birth, wherein "Christ is born in us the hope of glory." And thus, "born of water and of the Spirit," we are elevated into the sphere of grace where we are able to grow, and be nurtured in the divine life. The food that nourishes this new-born creature is the glorified life of Christ. This is communicated to us by the Word, and symbolically and mystically confirmed and sealed to us by the sacrament of His body and blood. The sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel sets this in

* When the child comes of proper age it must take its baptismal vows upon itself, and thus ratify the act of the parents or sponsors.

a clear light: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life," etc. (vers. 53, 54, *et seq.*). Some writers, we know, catch at the straw found in verse 63, by which they hope to deliver themselves from drowning in the sea of ritualistic sacramentarianism of the preceding verses. Or, to be plain, it is an effort to make Jesus overturn and demolish, by this one verse, the glorious fabric which He had so carefully built up in the preceding verses. His doctrine was offensive to his immediate hearers then, and it appears to be offensive to many of his followers now. But Jesus does not contradict Himself. "It is the Spirit that giveth life, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life" (ver. 63). This evidently means that the Spirit in the Word gives life; and the Word and sacrament together are the objective means through which that life is communicated to the believer. And in the sacramental transaction, while bread and wine are received into the mouth in the natural way, the life-giving power of Christ's flesh and blood is received by faith in a supernatural way, and is appropriated and assimilated by the spiritual new man, and it thus becomes the pabulum of a never-ending life—the life of the glorified Christ—in the believer.

That we have apprehended the true meaning of our Saviour's mysterious language, appears very evident as soon as we compare it with the words of institution of the Holy Supper: "Take, eat, this is my body, broken for you, etc." If He had not instituted the Supper, or used the words here quoted, His language in the 6th of John would have remained unintelligible. Even His immediate disciples failed to catch His mysterious meaning till after the institution. But they have recorded His words, and also inform us of their observance of His command, as a guide and example for His future followers.

These ordinances are, therefore, not empty ceremonies, which men may use or ignore at their pleasure, and yet enjoy all the blessings they were intended to convey, "for they are actual channels, through which God's grace is conveyed to His people."

And since this is His appointed way, it is hard to see how, or why, Christians can hope to receive this grace in any other way. And it is equally hard to see how He can approve any other methods, that men may presume to substitute for them, especially when they pretend to see more virtue in their own inventions than in His ordinances.

It is easy to see, therefore, that the tendency of this peculiarly subjective age to disparage these objective means of grace, is a peculiarly dangerous tendency. And if our Church is to maintain her educational and churchly stand-point, she must counteract this tendency. The pastors of the churches must guard, not against the young people's societies, or against the development of an enthusiastic energy and a wakeful activity in pushing forward their work—but against the possibility of their being carried away by their enthusiasm, into the fatal snare of the meritoriousness of their own good works. Let them always be kept in remembrance that they are what they are by divine grace; and not by what they do for Christ. "By grace ye are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2: 8-10). And let no man "think of himself more highly than he ought to think." (Rom. 12: 3).

Such warnings as these are intended to keep us humble, and to assist us in resisting the temptation to spiritual pride and self-exaltation, which almost invariably mar the Christian character of those who despise the objective means of grace, and boast of their personal experience and of their good deeds.

We might here also refer to the manner in which the preaching of the Gospel, sometimes, comes in for a share of the contempt which the Church and the sacraments have suffered. Singing and prayer, which are, or ought to be, addressed to God, as acts of worship, are sometimes substituted for preaching, which is an appeal to men; and in this way, by a special

and lively effort, attempts are made to sing and pray men into the kingdom, by simply an appeal to their emotional nature. And, accordingly, we are often confronted, in religious and semi-religious papers, with the discouraging thought, that the "pulpit is declining," that it is "losing its hold on the people," that other means are more effectual in bringing sinners to Christ, etc. And this may be true in some quarters; but it is not true where ministers and churches honor the ordinances of God. Preaching, along with the sacraments, is the only divinely-appointed means of saving men, and, in the past, they have been regarded as the true marks of the true Church, over against unchurchly sectarianism, which cuts itself off by exalting some peculiar dogma, true or false, or else by adopting some practice or method foreign to the Church.

This view of the Church and her sacramental energies here advocated, is often characterized as formalism; and it must be confessed that there is danger here, too, which must also be avoided. And we may say here that the formalist is satisfied with mere forms without the inward life; and in this he is the extremely opposite of the fanatic, who gets on satisfactorily to himself without the use of these forms at all.

But Christ has instituted these forms, and whether He is chargeable with formalism or not, He has commanded us to use them. It will not do to say that ritualism and ceremonialism have been done away, because the ceremonial law of Judaism has been abrogated. Only its temporary forms have been done away. Its eternal principles remain, and are embodied symbolically in the sacraments and in the Word; and while the veil of the temple is rent in twain, and God may now be approached immediately by the repenting sinner, yet if he sets aside or ignores the means of grace, he can have no assurance of acceptance at the throne of grace.

Any one who can lightly ignore the objective means of grace, must do it in the face of Christ's own appointment, and of His own personal example; and thus he argues a one-sided subjective view of religion, which finds no countenance in the Bible;

and thus he puts more confidence in his own good feelings and good deeds, than in the grace of God, which bringeth salvation.

That Jesus honored the appointments of God in the Old Testament, is evident to every one who carefully studies His history. The Gospels do not, of course, profess to record all that Jesus said and did, as St. John informs us (John 20: 30 and 21: 35). But they do record enough to show that He faithfully observed the outward ordinances of religion then in force, by a perfect obedience to the ceremonial law, in order, as He expressed it, "to fulfill all righteousness" (Matt. 3: 18). Thus He was circumcised the eighth day, and presented in the temple on the fortieth day (Luke 2: 21, 22, *et seq.*), by His parents, of course; and afterwards, when twelve years old, He was made a "son of the law," and became thereby a full member of the Church, subjecting Himself to all the requirements of the law. Again, when He was ready to enter upon the duties of His office, He submitted to John's Baptism, which was followed by the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the word from heaven, declaring Him to be the well-beloved Son of God (Matt. 3: 16-17). During His three years' ministry He attended three Passovers (John 2: 13; 5: 1, and the last, recorded by all the Synoptists). He also attended the Feast of Tabernacles (John 7: 2, 10), and the Feast of Dedication (John 10: 22), and, doubtless, if we had a complete record, it would show that He was present, as a loyal Jew, at every feast prescribed by the law. But besides this, He honored the law, when He miraculously healed diseases, for which the law prescribed offerings, as in the case of the lepers (Matt. 8: 2-4, and Luke 17: 11-16), whom, in both instances, He directed to show themselves to the priests; and in one of the cases it is added, "and offer the gift that Moses commanded."

With all these facts before us, and also the knowledge that He insisted on strict obedience to the moral law, as well as on a right, inward, spiritual conformity to the demands of purity, holiness and love, who will dare to affirm, that He ever treated the outward means of grace with anything else but the highest

reverence and respect? And while He rebuked the unworthy men who filled the priesthood, He held the office in honor, as an institution of divine appointment. Can any one think to please Jesus, by speaking lightly of the ministry, or of the Church, or of the word and sacraments, which Christ appointed to take the place, in the new dispensation, of those ordinances which He so highly honored in the old? Are these means of grace to be set aside as antiquated, because the spirit of the age requires, and perhaps needs the application of new methods of working for Christ and the evangelization of the world? We think not. All these organizations, with their new methods of work, may be welcomed as auxiliary to the regular means of spreading the gospel; and we may, therefore, accept their aid, and use it in a legitimate way to help forward the glorious work. But let us be careful lest our zeal run away with our discretion, and lead us to relegate to the background the appointments of God, and substitute in their place the inventions of men.

V.

CHRISTIANITY AT THE END OF THIS AGE.

BY REV. J. G. NOSS.

THE thinking people of our time are, as a rule, divided into optimists and pessimists. To one class the future of the Church and the world is all brightness, to the other all gloom. The unbiased Christian student of history and Holy Scripture knows that while neither is wholly right as over against the other, both the seer of coming light and the seer of coming night have good ground for their prophecies. For while sin is present in the world and in the Church, there can be but one answer by the watchman to the challenge, "What of the night?" "*The morning cometh and also the night.*" In history, both profane and sacred, as in nature, light and darkness alternate. Joy and gladness give place to woes alike in "sad Ilion and sacred Salem." The same is true in the history of Christianity.

But what of the future? The unscriptural theory dominant in the Church for centuries, that Christianity, *in this age*, is to achieve a complete triumph over Satan and his legions is accountable for much of the modern perplexity. The complacent optimist, feeling confident that the final triumph of Christianity, if not in sight, cannot be far off, accepts, often under the protest of his better judgment, the modern schemes for bringing about the desired end. His zeal for the bringing in of the expected millennium forbids his rejection of any means or measures which its projectors may claim to be especially ordained of God to evangelize the world. The gloomy pessimist, accepting the traditional theory as the genuine teaching of Christ and His Apostles, seeing the present condition of things

in the Church and the world, and judging the future by the past, is all too ready to despair of any outcome but that of utter ruin, and to look upon Christianity as a failure, even if he does not go into the growing camp of the enemy.

But is this theory unscriptural? Is the Christianity of this age to share the experience of its type, the Judaism of the Old Testament,—illustrious in faith in the beginning, thriving under persecution, conquering its enemies, reigning gloriously in the midst of the earth, pride and perfidy bringing it into Babylonish captivity, a re-invigorated faith reforming its teaching and morals, and the coming in of the world-spirit causing it at last to reject the true Messiah and to be deceived by the false? If even there were no corroborating teaching in Holy Scripture, the question of the Saviour in Luke 18: 8 ("When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith in the earth?") should be conclusive to show that instead of the world, in this age, being conquered by Christian faith, that faith itself should almost disappear from the earth before Christ comes. When He asked this question He either knew or He did not know the condition of Christianity at the end of this age. If He did not know, the popular theory, or any other, is baseless so far as the teaching of Christ is concerned. If He did know, as He certainly did, the question is simply inconceivable on the basis of such knowledge of universal faith in Him at His coming as that theory assumes. In the closing verses of the preceding chapter He declares the lightning-like suddenness of His second advent and the unpreparedness of the world at His unexpected coming, as in the days of Noah and Lot. And by the parable of the Unjust Judge in the verses immediately preceding, He urges the necessity of patience and perseverance in the faith (and that under trying circumstances) unto the end. The interrogative particle (*ara*) is not translated. Yet on this word depends the nature of the answer to the question. In Greek usage this particle almost invariably demands an emphatic negative answer to the question in which it appears. Besides its use in this passage, it occurs twice in the New Testament.

Paul uses it in Gal. 2: 17 ("Is Christ the minister of sin?") and Luke in Acts 8: 30 ("Understandest thou what thou readest?") While it is not to be presumed that the use of *are* in the question before us demands an absolute negative as in Gal. 2: 17, yet as over against the prevalent theory it shows beyond doubt that when the Lord comes at the end of this age He shall find comparatively few of His followers firm and steadfast in the faith. *Pistis* has the article, *the* faith, not faith in God in a general sense, but the faith (including faithfulness) which is the condition, over against all human merit and works, of participation in the special inheritance in Christ which is made known in this age by the Gospel.

But the teaching of Christ in this passage is also abundantly corroborated by Him and the Apostles in Holy Scripture elsewhere. Let a few selections suffice: "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved." (Matth. 24: 12, 13). This is spoken, not of the unbelieving world, but of Christians. Among these *anomia* (lawlessness) shall abound in the last days. It is *agape* that shall wax cold—a word not used in Greek literature, but always in the New Testament to express the newly revealed love of God to man, and in man as he is made one in Christ with the Father. And it is the love of *ton pollon*, the many, that is, the majority of believers, that shall thus wax cold. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils." (1 Tim. 4: 1). "This know also that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness (*eusebeia*), but denying the power thereof." (2 Tim. 3: 1-5). All this emphasizes the fact that what Paul calls the *apostasia*, or falling away, is not external defection so

much as internal. Under the semblance of devotion to Christ, saying, "Lord, Lord," the majority of professing Christians in the last days shall be far removed from Him in heart; thus realizing the condition of typical Judaism at the first advent of the Messiah. The majority of the Apostolic Fathers and the recently discovered *Didache* testify to the same condition of the Church at the end of this age.

Accepting all this as true, must we come to the conclusion that Christianity is a failure? God forbid. We might as well conclude that Christ is a failure. Judaism was no failure, though Jerusalem became desolate and her children were "scattered upon all the face of the earth," for the covenant-keeping Jehovah was identified with it. So Christ and Christianity are one; they stand or fall together. But how different from the popular conception was the outcome of Judaism in the past age! How the Lord "put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree" to be glorious pillars in the Church of the new age! And the prevalent unscriptural theory makes the same mistake with reference to this dispensation which the Jews made with reference to the person of the Messiah in the days of His humiliation. The Messiah is represented in the prophecies of the Old Testament as the Son of David reigning with power and glory over the nations of the earth, and also as the stricken Man of sorrows. The dominant religious leaders of the people saw not in the lowly Galilean their partial and political conception of the King of the Jews, and therefore rejected Him and found in the aggressive Barabbas a nearer approach to their ideal. The coming in of the world-spirit blinded their understanding so that they saw not the whole Messiah as delineated in Holy Scripture, though Jesus of Nazareth was fulfilling that Scripture jot by jot and tittle by tittle daily before their eyes. Likewise it should not be thought impossible, or strange even, that the people of the New Testament covenant should ultimately be ready, when the humanitarian conceptions and anti-Christian forces in the Church shall have come to full fruition, to see in the greatness and

power of the visible Antichrist, a nearer realization of their ideal of the kingdom of Heaven on earth than that which a weak and dying faith in the invisible and tarrying Christ presents. For the false conceptions of the true Christ and of His kingdom must inevitably prepare those who hold them to embrace the impersonation of the Antichristian spirit within them when once manifested. No, Christianity is not a failure; but our conception of what it is and what it is to accomplish in this age may be a complete failure.

But it may be objected to the views here presented, that the Word of God surely promises a reign of universal righteousness in which all men shall be drawn to Christ. True; but not in this age. This is the age of faith in the unseen Christ, not that of His *parousia*. It is the age of the election, not of the human race (for that should be no election); but that of the Church out of the human race. The very word, *ekklesia*, shows the purpose of Christ in this dispensation: "I have chosen you out of the world." As Christ was not of the world, so His chosen Church is not of the world. This is the Pentecostal age in which the first fruits of the spiritual harvest are gathered unto God. The full in-gathering of the Feast of Tabernacles, when the Spirit of God shall be poured out literally upon all flesh, belongs to the age to come. The past age was the age of Judaism, this age "is the time of the Gentiles;" the coming age is the age of the Jews and the Gentiles—that of the whole race. In this age Satan is not bound (though the nominal Church significantly makes less and less account of his presence and power), but "as a roaring lion walketh about seeking whom he may devour," "is transformed into an angel of light," and "his ministers are transformed as ministers of righteousness." In the age to come he is to be bound and his hand is to be stayed from sowing tares in the field of God's own planting, and "all the nations of the earth shall go up to Jerusalem from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles."

But what, it may be asked, is the Gospel of Christ to accom-

plish in this age if it shall fail to bring all the world to have faith in Him? Just that which any Gospel of God has ever been intended to accomplish in this world: the salvation of men from impending destruction. For we must not forget that we can only speak of salvation over against condemnation. There can be no "brand plucked out of the fire," if there be no fire. The promise comes after the fall and because of it, and salvation comes after the sentence of condemnation and because of it. The wrath of God upon sin abides; the salvation of the sinner is the parenthesis of God's mercy in the sentence of condemnation. If there be no consummation of the sentence of condemnation, the Gospel of Christ has neither meaning nor necessity for the world. On this account the announcement of judgment always accompanies, or rather forms a part of, the message of salvation to man. Noah's preaching must have been of this twofold character. The sum and substance of the preaching of John, the Baptist, and of Jesus to the Jews, was: "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." This very language conveys the announcement of the impending wrath of God upon them, as well as the glad tidings of salvation to them. *Because* "the axe is laid unto the root of the tree," they were warned "to flee from the wrath to come" by repenting of their sins and by believing in Jesus as the Christ of God. So, also, is the Gospel of Christ to be preached in this age in all the world, both as "a witness to all nations," and as the means of salvation to them that believe. Paul, on the Areopagus, tells the Athenians, in his interrupted sermon, that all men everywhere are called upon to repent, *because* a day has been appointed in which the world is to be judged in righteousness by the risen Jesus.

All men are sinners, and all sinners to whom the Gospel is presented stand related to Jesus Christ as believers and saved, or unbelievers and condemned. All believers, again, stand related to Him as faithful or faithless in the faith. To both unbelievers and faithless believers, Christ is a righteous Judge, and is to be proclaimed as such by every minister of the Gospel.

The Gospel of love alone is indeed the greatest thing in the world to those who love; but it is not the whole message of Christ to the world. The weeping, loving Magdalene tremblingly adores the Lord of Love because she has found in Him release from the bitter bondage of sin and Satan. The incontinent Felix is made to tremble by Paul's preaching to him the same Christ as the coming Judge. The Whole Christ is to be preached and to be believed in, and only so can we know, according to Paul's seeming paradox, the love of God which passeth all understanding. The preaching of only half the Christ must be preaching without strength. It is certain that both unbelievers and faithless believers are comfortable under it. And even where the Gospel is preached to men for the first time, as in our Foreign Mission fields, it seems but weak in effect compared with what our conceptions are of what it is in itself and what we know its power was upon men in the beginning. Could this be so if the whole Christ were preached? Christ, as Paul preached Him, for instance, aside from all miraculous manifestations, was made to confront all men *critically*. All men are made to feel that they must accept or reject, not His moral teachings, but *Him*. He is presented to them as the only Prophet, Priest and King through whom men may gain any true knowledge of God, be freed from sin, made God-like in character, be eternally blessed, and by whom all men are ultimately to be judged according to the deeds done in the body. All men must stand or fall by Him, and it is all-important that the offered Saviour be accepted *at once*, for He will surely come soon to bring eternal weal or woe to each one as he has accepted or rejected Him. This kind of preaching once "turned the world upside down," and perhaps if every watchman on the walls of Zion should so proclaim Him to-day, both the Church and the world should be disturbed not a little. Is it not startling, however, that the preaching which is supposed to be successful in bringing the world to Christ is that which is popular alike with the believer and the unbeliever? While the Master was preparing His first disciples to preach

this Gospel He warned them against that which is so much sought after now, and which is so often taken as evidence of success: "Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you; for so did their fathers to the false prophets." Satan has not fallen in love with the Gospel in these last days any more than at the first, but he has evidently become complacent under the accommodating manner of its presentation.

But the descent is easy from preaching only half the Christ to eliminating Him from the sermon altogether; not His name, indeed, nor yet his moral teachings, but *Him*. True faith holds that Christ is the Head, and that the Church is His Body; that He is Wisdom, not simply the Teacher of wisdom; that He is the Life, not simply the Teacher of the way of life; and that He is the Door to Heaven, and not simply the Way-pointer. All this is ignored in the growing tendency to *teach Christianity without preaching Christ*. That is, Christianity, to be successful, must be adapted to the times. The norm for Christian activity is not "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which alone can make men "free from the law of sin and death," and which they need, but rather the modification and adaptation of that norm to what the Church and the world will accept. Under this accommodation Christianity is growingly viewed by the world, and by many professing Christians, as a religion instituted by Jesus of Nazareth and consisting of certain ceremonies and injunctions for daily living, the faithful observance of which opens the gates of Heaven to its adherents. It is thought to compare favorably with others in a Parliament of Religions, and to show its superiority to all others, if not in antiquity, at least in its teachings of purer morals, in its educational and charitable institutions, and especially in the greater civilization and enlightenment of the nations brought under its influence. Under this accommodation, too, there is a prevalent and growing feeling that the preaching of the Word, however faithfully done, and the heaven-ordained Sacraments have largely lost their power for good, and that the success of Christianity must depend on other

activities of the Church. Hence we hear much of the power of organizations, enthusiasm, numbers, etc., and yet according to true faith there is but one power that can effect the salvation of men: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for *it is the power of God* unto salvation to every one that believeth." If we were to stop long enough to think what "the *power of God*" is, we should think very little, and say much less, of the power of men, women and children. But who that thinks at all seriously does not see that the tendency is more and more to have confidence, not in what Christ is to us and what He has done for us, but rather in what we do for Him and for the world? And is it not the very essence of apostasy to substitute merely human power, zeal and activity for the power and work of God? When God does not manifest His power in and through man upon the moral world, Satan is sure to do so. "When they knew God they glorified Him not as God, . . . but changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts and creeping things, . . . and changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator."

Are we fully awake to the fact that a degeneracy of faith in God is going on before our eyes as great as that which Paul so graphically describes in these words as being the case of the Gentile descendants of Noah? Of course not along the line of the gross forms of the idolatry of the ancient world. Satan is too subtle for that. He compasses the undoing of the covenanted people in these days by begetting pride in them in those things which they have, or think they have, in abundance; whether these things be material or spiritual, or both. The Church in Smyrna is poor, but rich; the Church in Laodicea is "rich and increased with goods and has need of nothing," but "is wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked." The "poor in spirit" are now the blessed, and God has chosen the "poor of this world rich in faith." Satan does not repeat the mistake he made with Job and the Christians of the early

centuries. He knows that "when Jeshurun waxed fat he kicked."

Many illustrations of this downward process in the faith suggest themselves. Let a few suffice. Not to mention the spiritual adulteries of God's people in other days, and in other countries, think of the hot race for social and political power and influence in this country between the larger denominations, with the smaller ones training in their tactics and imitating their pace. Think, too, of the great number of ministers of the Gospel and members of the Church of Christ affiliated with the secret societies of the land. Why this hot race, and why this recourse to the societies of this world? Though both the denominations and the individuals, in this case, spurn the imputation that they are doing evil that good may come, from the stand-point of faith there simply can be no other and at the same time true answer. True faith looks to Christ for all power to be, to know, and to do good. To turn aside from Christ in order to realize any of these is, for the Christian, to do evil. And surely no denomination, or individual, is willing to confess to be doing evil for its own sake. But if they do not resort to Cæsar and to human associations to "seek the Kingdom of Heaven," it must be the "other things" they are after. Of like character, too, is the temperance movement of our time. Turning away from the true conception of temperance as *self-continnence* or *inward strength* (*egkrateia*), which is the fruit of the Spirit of God in the Christian, these would-be reformers of the Church and the world have descended from one stage to another until they have fairly landed in the flesh in the Prohibition movement of the day. Having turned away from Christ, they look to Cæsar for help. Christ's life and Spirit in man have made millions temperate; Cæsar never has made and never can make a single human being truly temperate.

This is the time for watching and warning. "O son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the Word at My mouth, and warn them from Me." The Saviour and the apostles never speak of the end of

this age without emphasizing the necessity for watching. The powers that come into play at this time are so subtle, so refined, and the deceiveriness of sin so great, that, if it were possible, the very elect should be deceived. "Blessed are those servants whom the Lord, when He cometh, shall find watching." "Watch ye, therefore, that ye may be counted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man." This watching implies the necessity of trying the spirits, whether they be of God, and of discerning the signs of the times. The Saviour and the Apostles should not have so emphasized the dangers, and given the attending signs of these last days, if there were no impending peril to Christian faithfulness. "For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth."

The most prominent mark given us is the coming of Antichrist. Without any claim whatever to superior knowledge, it may be well to direct attention to a few things which are recognized by many as facts, however they may differ as to their bearing upon the subject in hand. Antichrist can be no sudden, shock-producing manifestation in the world. He must be the embodiment of the life and spirit of his age, and that in its highest or spiritual form; for he "as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The chief factor in such a product must be the development of a preceding spiritual monarchy. There should be no difficulty in recognizing this in the development and history of the Roman Papacy. But there can be no development of a spiritual monarchy without a corresponding tendency all the while to spiritual anarchy. And there should be no difficulty in recognizing this tendency in the development and history of Protestantism. Both these tendencies had their root already in the apostolic Church. If the Bishop of Rome had always truly represented Christ to the Church and the world, and should do so now, no harm could come from the Papacy. But this has by no means been done. So also, if the private judgment of Protestantism were always the judgment of Christ, no harm could come from

it. But it is equally true that Protestantism has not always faithfully represented the Christ of God. The authority in both cases is originally from God (for Christ by His Spirit and Word feeds and governs His flock both directly and through vicegerents); but the exercise of that authority has by no means always been with right motives and for right ends. History unmistakably shows that the world-spirit has been a strong element in the development of both tendencies, so that to-day Christ and Cæsar are sadly interchanged as objects of homage by both Protestant and Roman Catholic. This false development of the Papacy may be taken to be the positive element preparing the way for the antichristian monarchy, and the false development of personal liberty and private judgment, with its anarchical manifestations both in the Church and the world, may be said to constitute its negative element. Modern progress in science and art furnishes the external condition required by bringing the ends of the world together.

The end cannot be far off. The intense, gigantic forces at work in the world of our day must bring about the great crisis. The spirit of the world, in this day of world-expositions and world-congresses, reaches out over the globe and brings the whole race under its influence at one and the same time as was never possible before. And nominal Christianity, alas, is more and more yielding to this same spirit, and, consciously or unconsciously, is even paying court to the moral, social and political forces of the world, as if these were the handmaids of Christ. Moreover, we are not to forget that "judgment must begin at the house of God." When the Lord spews out of His mouth the lukewarm Church of Laodicea, that other saying of His shall also be fulfilled: "Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men." These many centuries has Christianity postponed the final judgment of God upon the world; but when it shall have ceased to be faithful to Christ, and become the Babylonish harlot, He shall change the broken reed of the

world-power on which it leans into the iron rod of its chastisement. But it is ever the way of God to come to the help of His own when they most need it. Christ shall come when all seems lost, and take to Himself the faithful (translated) living and (risen) dead Christians, until the woes be past; for it is written: "Come, My people, enter into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself, as it were, for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For, behold, the Lord cometh out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity." "And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." But it is not the world alone that asks in our day: "Where is the promise of His coming?" Gnosticism in the Church is by no means entirely a heresy of the past. How frequently are we told that "Christ has often come since He ascended into Heaven;" that "He comes to each one in death," etc. And yet all Christendom for many centuries has confessed, as one of the cardinal articles of its faith, "From *thence* He shall come to judge the quick and the dead." We might as well say that He has often been conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary; often, been crucified, and often risen from the dead, and often ascended into Heaven, as to say He has often come in the sense of this article of the Apostles' Creed. It means the second Advent of our Lord, and never anything else. And this coming of Christ is the blessed hope of the Church from His ascension until its realization at the end of this age. The coming of the Holy Ghost, as "the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession," and His mediatorial work in receiving the things of Christ and showing them unto us, place us into such living relation to Christ as that we can look forward to His Advent with such glad hope as does the faithful, loving bride to the coming of the bridegroom.

He follows the Church Year with little profit who sees in the Advent season only "a preparation for Christmas." The Scripture lessons, the collects and hymns of the whole Advent season

look altogether in a different direction. Advent Sunday is the end and the beginning of the Church Year—the end, however, because it is the day of the consummation of this dispensation whose history is set forth, in brief, in that year; and the beginning, because it is meant to mark the epoch of the more glorious age to follow. And just because He does not come whom the Church longs to hail with the glad cry: “Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord,” the Church Year reluctantly, it seems (for the first three Sundays in Advent still look to His second coming), leads us back to commemorate again the great facts in the history of our redemption. The only hope of and for Christianity, and the only hope for the world, is the coming again of our Lord. But, alas, the major portion of the Christianity of our day challenges us to believe in many things as being able to accomplish that which He alone can bring to pass by His coming. Faith, simple, child-like faith in the whole Christ of God is the great lack and need of our day.

VI.

THE MORAL DIFFICULTIES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY REV. A. J. HELLER, A. M.

THE morality of the Old Testament has often been made the subject of adverse criticism by those who do not believe in the inspiration of the holy Scriptures. They claim that it is not consistent with the transcendently righteous and holy character of God to use, for the accomplishment of His gracious designs and purposes, men so lacking in the principles of truth and justice, so impure, and so wanting in the grace of charity, as the Old Testament saints. These skeptically-inclined persons even take pleasure in searching out the mistakes, foibles and follies of the Hebrew fathers and leaders, and the moral defects and blemishes of the Hebrew governmental and social system for the purpose of heaping ridicule upon the whole plan of redemption as historically unfolded from the promise given in Eden to the fulfillment of that promise in the advent of Christ.

There are others who become perplexed and distressed, if not completely unsettled in their opinion concerning the truth of the whole of God's Word, when they are confronted with facts and events that appear to be inconsistent or in extreme contrast with what they think any scheme inaugurated and sustained by a just and holy God should be.

Much special pleading and many specious arguments have been employed to reconcile or to explain, consistently with the character of God and the final purpose He has in view, the moral imperfections of the Old Testament as a whole and the imperfections of its most prominent and illustrious personages.

With some a favorite method of explanation has been to subordinate everything to the power and will of God. As He is the author of life He has a sovereign right to deal with it and to dispose of it according to His pleasure. But the morality of God cannot differ from the morality of man. He cannot, therefore, use His power or exercise His will in an arbitrary way, or for other than moral ends. The only sovereignty that can be permitted to reign here is moral sovereignty. Others have preferred to wave aside these problems as inscrutable mysteries, and have comforted themselves with the thought that, while inexplicable and unjustifiable to the human reason and shocking to the enlightened Christian conscience, the acts and systems in question are, somehow, in perfect harmony with God's higher and better wisdom. But this way of disposing of difficulties in the sacred Scriptures is now felt to be unsatisfactory and altogether fallacious. The spirit of free inquiry and the study of the Scriptures inaugurated by the Reformation of the sixteenth century and the historical method of criticism and interpretation which has been growing in favor, are beginning to yield important results. The Bible is gaining in clearness and strength because it is being viewed as the record of an historical process of revelation and development. The advance made in science has contributed much towards this by training the mind to grasp the idea of creation as a unity, an organic whole.

There has been much speculation and disputation on the part of scientists in regard to the origin, antiquity and primitive condition of man, and concerning the means of his development. In 1854 Whately, then Archbishop of Dublin, argued that man could not have advanced from a low state of barbarism without the aid of an instructor to guide him up to a certain point, which point he did not define; and that since man had no other source of knowledge, his divine Creator must have been his Teacher.

In reply to Whately's lecture, Sir John Lubbock (in 1867), at a meeting of the British Association for the Advancement

of Science, read a paper upon "The Early Condition of Mankind." In this paper he came to the conclusion that the primitive condition of mankind was that of utter barbarism; that certain races, by their own unaided efforts, have raised themselves to a higher condition; and that all civilized races are the descendants of men who were once in the lowest possible state of savagery.

The Duke of Argyle discusses the subject in a little work on "Primeval Man," and attempts to put the question into better shape for future consideration and discussion. He regards the proof which each of the aforementioned authors adduces as insufficient. Dr. Whately, for instance, cites as examples a few tribes which have never made any progress towards civilization, and concludes from this that no savage tribe ever did advance, or ever can advance towards the use of mechanical arts and social organization without help from abroad. On the other hand, Sir John Lubbock presents tribes which have made some progress, and claims that they did so without any aid. The relative value of the examples cannot be determined, for there is no record of how the tribes which have made some progress came to do so; and a record left by any tribe or race would prove contact with higher or advanced races and destroy the value of the example.

The Duke of Argyle believes it to be true "that the desire of knowledge is capable of excess," and that the question concerning the origin, antiquity and primitive condition of man, possibly never can be answered on the basis of what are termed scientific data alone. In answer to Bishop Whately he observes, that, "even if savage races be taken as the type of man's Primeval Condition, the evidence of these races is all in favor of the conclusion that, as regards his characteristic mental powers, Man has always been Man, and nothing less;" and that, as the instinct in birds enables them to build nests, so the correspondingly higher endowments of man enable him to cast a stone and wield a club, and thus step by step learn not only to use the material of this earth, but also to fashion it into means for the

execution of his designs. And in reply to Sir J. Lubbock, to whose argument he attaches still less importance, he remarks, in substance, that whilst man's intelligence may have been very limited, it does not follow that he was without a true knowledge of God and a sense of obligation to live in obedience to moral law; that there is nothing more certain than that man is liable to degenerate; that even now, with all the agencies of the Christian religion to hold them up against the opposing influences of sin, men do degrade. He claims that the evidences of degradation are just as great as those of advancement amongst the tribes, which he cites as examples to prove his position. Whether primeval man raised himself by his own unaided efforts, whether he was aided by an instructor who guided him from a lower to a higher condition, or whether he degraded from a state of intelligence and purity, are questions which here concern us only to show how little has been accomplished towards their solution on scientific grounds, and to indicate the consensus of opinion as to the actual condition of the race when it first appears upon the stage of recorded history. Passing by the first few chapters of the book of Genesis which contain the account of the creation and fall of man, we straightway have him presented to us in the succeeding chapters as occupying that same low plane of civilization and morality on which he is found wherever he is seen emerging from the grey mists of pre-historic times. And the problem which God proposed to Himself—we speak reverently in terms of accommodation—the solution of which with its intricacies and difficulties is recorded in the sacred Scriptures—was that of man's elevation and sanctification; the development within him of a conscience keenly alive to the obligation of obedience to the law of divine love. And, to do this, that law had to be implanted and ingrained into man's being, so as to become an inner principle of action, giving direction, tone and strength to his life. To become this, the law had, in the beginning, to be presented to him in an outward, institutional way. He had, by a process of elementary training under the law written and *engraved* in

stone, to be gradually prepared for it before it could, through his faith in Christ, enter his life, be *engraved* on his heart, and so become an ever-present, inner motive to right living.

No tongue or pen can gather up and picture the horrible wickedness, the cruelty, the beastly sensuality which has been perpetrated by man everywhere, even in the presence of the gospel of truth and purity. History and experience bear unimpeachable testimony to the depravity of the race. Yet, man still has within him the elements of a virtuous being. He is not so fallen as to have lost all aptitude for the good and the true, the basis upon which to found the structure of a beautiful and perfect manhood. There is left within him the original germ, which needs only to be quickened and nourished by the necessary divine conditions of its life in order to grow and bear fruit unto righteousness and holiness. This much must be conceded to start with, for "was nicht im Keim liegt kann auch nicht in der Ernte sein." The germ must contain the future harvest. No matter how we account for the depravity of the human race, the low moral and spiritual condition in which it is everywhere found; no matter to what extent man has fallen, as Argyle says, he is still man; he still possesses the elements of true and perfect manhood. Besides, in historical times we find him making earnest efforts towards bettering his condition. That when left to himself his strivings have not issued in any permanent results, is true. And that his moral development could not go forward and result in anything of permanent value without help from above and beyond himself, has been demonstrated by the utter failure of all heathenism on the one hand, and on the other hand, by the complete success which crowned the efforts of the chosen race guided by divine revelation. This we regard as one of the strongest arguments for the truth and value of the Old Testament Scriptures. It is, in a broad sense, a form of self-authentication; for nothing so conclusively proves the vitality of a seed as the harvest it bears.

Morality and religion are not the same, but they are closely allied to each other; so closely, indeed, that it is doubtful

whether they can be wholly separated. Both are conceptions of man's spiritual being, and both must be present, therefore, as correlative and fundamental agencies in any educational system employed for his complete development. Religion without morality soon degenerates into dead formality and hypocritical cant; and morality without religion has nowhere been found. There are those who profess—and appear, too,—to have abandoned all faith in revelation and in supernatural power and help, and yet are very moral in their conduct; but their morality can always be traced to a root of faith that is hidden, and its continued support to a distinctively religious environment. The religion of a people determines the character and worth of their morality. It is true that heathenism has produced some single characters of high moral rank, whilst many in the midst of an atmosphere of revealed truth have sunk very low; but the general plane of moral social life has always been higher in the latter, and by repeated uplifts from age to age has advanced to the present high standard of Christian consciousness, while heathenism has again and again gone to pieces. It is right here that the whole broad gulf between the success of the Hebrew morality and the failure of the heathen morality is to be measured. The philosophical speculations of the heathen are not without merit, and are to be duly appreciated in their proper sphere; but so far as bringing any real saving power to the aid of the race is concerned, they utterly failed. They lacked the inspiration of a perfect ideal, the promise and assurance of whose future realization alone could keep alive hope in the heart. They contained no promise or prophesy of a Messiah in whom a complete development of all the elements of perfect manhood was to be realized. Every effort of heathenism was isolated from every other, and began and ended on the same plane. The heathen mind could invent schemes; but every invention had for its principle some temporal expedient, well-being or pleasure, which never led the masses beyond the refined doctrine of Epicureanism; and when it did attempt to soar aloft, it never got beyond the hazy atmosphere of specu-

lative philosophy—too high for the masses to follow, and not high enough to come down again, bringing any actual help to them. There was no pure heaven above them. Their divinities and celestial abodes were no better than the dwellers and the abodes of earth. If they would succeed at all, they must first purify the gods and cleanse the heavens, and that was a feat altogether beyond the ability of man to perform. Man's instinct demands a God of perfect morality; and whenever he discovers that the divinity he serves is not pure, he straightway abandons it. The human mind can no more tolerate contradictions and impurities in the divinity it serves, than it can allow defects in its own reasoning. No wonder, then, that the imaginations of the heathen filled the earth and Hades with myths and pictures of tormenting disappointments, the echoes of their sad wailings over the failure of human life to find its chief good and best estate.

On the other hand, the ideal which was held up to the Hebrew mind was an eternal, a perfect ideal. The Hebrew race received light and help from above; light that revealed a God of holiness and a heaven of purity. This idea of God's holiness is always kept before the minds of His people: "Who is like unto Thee, glorious in holiness." Holiness was inscribed upon the temple and upon the vestments of the priest who served at this altar. In this respect He was above the gods of the nations, and is called by way of emphasis, "The Holy One of Israel." This produced "the feeling of human sinfulness and impurity," and taught "the clearness and purity of the divine nature, which excludes all communion with what is wicked." * But if He had revealed Himself only as a God of Holiness, His people would have learned to know Him only as transcendent and unapproachable, and, therefore, not in vital touch and helpful sympathy with them. He, however, at the same time manifests Himself as a God of righteousness, and as one who loves and wills righteousness in His creatures. Righteousness means straightness, and the word is so used in the Old

* *Ehler's Old Testament Theology*, page 110.

Testament. A righteous man is one who walks by rule, by a straight line, or in a straight path. The line or path which God drew for His people's guidance is briefly comprehended in the decalogue. He shows Himself also as a God of compassion: "As a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." They are encouraged to draw near unto Him, to trust in Him for help and strength. Glancing along the line of Israel's history preserved for us in the Old Testament, we observe that, with all its vicissitudes, there is a gradual approach to the high moral standard revealed in the personal life of the Son of Man. We say gradual approach, for the action of God towards the human subject was limited in its operations and effects by the will of the latter.

"God revealed Himself in divers ways unto the fathers." How the revelation was at any time made, whether the Spirit of God communicated with man's spirit immediately or mediately through some external agent, does not concern us now. This much, however, is certain and must be maintained, namely, that the revelation was truly objective; that it had due regard to man's prerogatives as a free agent; and that its presentation was, therefore, in such form and manner as to leave man free to accept and appropriate it, or to reject it. This at times caused it to be, if not misapprehended, at least imperfectly apprehended, the revelation becoming clearer to the understanding as it entered into and became a part of the actual history and experience of God's chosen people. It also necessitated the graduating of revelation to the capacity of those to whom and for whom it was made, keeping always just far enough in advance to lead them, step by step, into higher and better ways of life. For religious and moral growth must ever be largely the result of man's own effort. His mind and will are important factors in the accomplishment of his salvation. Though counseled and influenced by the Word and Spirit of God, he must yield voluntary submission to the Divine will. Hence the moral development of the race is necessarily progressive, and, like the tide of the sea, has its ebb and flow.

Revelation had to enter the sphere of human life and to develop historically. And it had to effect a lodgment in the life of the race at its lowest stage, and to increase in fullness and power as this expanded under its benign influence. Man's moral consciousness could not be developed instantaneously by a single forensic declaration, or by a stroke of infinite divine power; nor could revelation in all its completeness enter the world at a single bound. History in its deepest ground is the effort of human life, under the divine guidance and help, to emancipate itself from the thralldom of sin and to reach the goal for which it was destined by the Creator. Man is the organ as well as the object of God's revelation; he is the agent in God's hand for the accomplishment of his own spiritual development.

This in itself is an answer to the often repeated question: "Why did God employ imperfect men to be the bearers of His grace and salvation, or the agents to execute His purposes?" That salvation came by man becomes a truth of very wide application as soon as it is understood and acknowledged that the springs of his life are really in God. God had, therefore, to employ man himself as His agent; and He had to take him as He found him. In this He mercifully adapted Himself to man's low condition, and exercised patience and long-suffering towards him, not willing that he should be left to perish in his sins. It was the beginning, in time, of that condescension which culminated in the self-humiliation of His Son to be "born of a woman, born under the law, that He might redeem them which were under the law."

There is no contradiction between the morality of Christ and that of His human antecedents. The latter, being relative and imperfect, but growing, ultimately finds its completion in the former. The two are essentially the same. Christ gathers up into Himself all the threads of history, those that run back to its beginning as well as those that run forward to its end. The absolute standard of morals, therefore, which the perfect man Christ Jesus reveals to us; the high moral consciousness and

the highly developed individual conscience of the present age, are the result of centuries of patient forbearance, instruction, and disciplinary training employed on the part of Jehovah, and of numberless severe conflicts waged, and retributive punishment suffered on the part of man. The training which the race underwent was sometimes, apparently, harsh, cruel, and lavish, instead of sparing of human life; but it was always such as was fraught with the least evil; it was the best that could be effectually employed under the circumstances, and at all times had in view high moral ends.

The thoughtful student cannot help being impressed with the fact that this has been the method and course of the history of which the Old Testament gives a faithful account, and of which it is itself a part; that it is a continuous onward movement; that in order to acquire a correct knowledge of it so as rightly to estimate its worth, he must view and study it as a whole, that he must consider and judge every actor in relation to his environments and in relation to the whole. The same principles of judgment are to be applied in this as are admitted in determining the value and the characters of other histories.

There are two acknowledged moral standards of judgment. The absolute moral standard is comprehended, not in an abstract command, but in the actual concrete life of Jesus Christ. According to this standard, acts in themselves, apart from their surroundings and their relations, are approved or condemned. The relative standard is the historical standard which requires us to take into consideration all the circumstances of an action or event, the degree of intelligence, the infirmities of human nature, and the individual and national environments. The imperfections of the past resulting from the incomplete development of moral consciousness must not be judged and condemned by the higher standard and more complete development of the spiritual life of the present. Moreover, not that which results from the weakness and imperfection of human nature as constituted since the fall, but that only which "proceeds from voluntary hatred and rebellion" is to be unqualifiedly condemned.

The characters of sacred history must, therefore, not be violently torn from their places and relations to be separately and independently judged by the absolute moral standard which the history, after a long and painful struggle, finally gained in the gift of God's Son; nor must any section or period of it be treated in a like fragmentary way. Truth demands that the acts and institutions of God and the agents He employed for the accomplishment of His beneficent designs be considered and judged of in the relations in which they are found and out of which they grew. Sacred history is, after all, intensely and essentially human. Acts performed at one time and under certain peculiar circumstances, may be wholly right, whilst, if performed at another time and under altogether different circumstances, they may be wholly wrong.

Keeping these things in mind, we turn to the consideration of some of the alleged moral difficulties that have been urged as serious objections to the claims of the Bible to be divinely inspired, and to contain the record of an historical divine revelation. As the space allotted us does not admit of the discussion of all the objections, we shall notice only the more familiar.

That God should have chosen Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to be the progenitors and leaders of a race that was to enjoy His special favor and care, and through which ultimately all nations were to be blessed; that He should have selected Moses and David as His agents, the one to lead His people from bondage to the land of freedom, the other to organize them into a permanent kingdom, separate and distinct from surrounding tribes—these and similar acts the avowed adversaries of Christianity declare to be inconsistent with the character of a righteous and holy God. For the characters of Abraham and Isaac are tarnished by the fact that they were capable of falsehood; Jacob practiced deception upon his confiding and blind father, and robbed his brother of his rightful inheritance; Moses slew an Egyptian and fled; while David was guilty of the most flagrant acts of immorality.

If we could draw again the veil, which has been gradually lifted, and shut out from our souls the spiritual light which has been increasing in brightness for the last three or four thousand years, so as to bring the range of our moral consciousness within the limits of their horizon; if we could sunder ourselves from the relations of moral supremacy to which our age has attained and surround ourselves with the low moral atmosphere which environed them; if we could, for a season, be what they were, occupy in all respects their position in history, and then again return to our present place without losing at any time our identity or the experience of the two states, we would be better able to judge to what extent they were culpable. In fact this is just what we must do so far as our knowledge of their times enables us to do it. They lived in the childhood of the world's history. Shall the child, with its feeble powers of thought and action, be judged by the same standard as the man of mature years whose faculties are fully developed? Should the act of Moses, who in defence of his kinsman slew an Egyptian and buried him in the sand, be judged by the same standard as the lynching of an offender is at the present day when men stand on an equality before the law, and when the courts are open for a fair trial and an impartial judgment? We do not mean to say that the men of that day were in no sense culpable; but that the degree of their culpability must be gauged by the light and the moral influences surrounding them.

But, aside from this, whom should God have chosen to be His special agents, if not those whom He did choose? Who is prepared to say that He, knowing what is in man, did not elect those who were in all respects best adapted to execute His will? Esau, a cunning hunter, though of a restless disposition, appears to have been the favorite with his father, and his popularity may have been due to his filial obedience, and constant fidelity to the interests of the family. On the other hand, Jacob, of a more ambitious, enterprising and at the same time grasping turn, taking advantage of his father's enfeebled condition and blindness, induced him by false statements and imper-

sonation to bestow upon him the paternal blessing that rightfully belonged to his brother. The Lord elected Jacob, and not Esau, to stand in the ancestral line of Christ, in which was borne onward and upward the moral movement of the world to the time of His advent; and the subsequent history proved the wisdom of the choice. Esau had not in him the nervous fibre, the daring energy and the settled purpose of which heroes and pioneers are made. The Lord does not call perfect men into His special service, for there are none such. He calls those who possess the undeveloped possibilities of performing heroic deeds, and achieving intellectual and moral greatness. "*Welt-Geschicht ist Welt-Gericht.*" A man's vocation is his judgment. He who proves faithful promotes his own and the growth of his people; works out his own and the salvation of the race. And the scriptural characters which are so severely criticised proved equal to the tests put upon them, and advanced, under the teaching and discipline of God, towards a higher condition of moral and religious life. They proved worthy leaders of the people whose moral elevation they were instrumental in promoting. Jacob repented of his transgressions, as did David. Strong characters present strong contrasts. Comparing different periods of David's life, we find contrasts of good and evil so extremely opposite that it is sometimes difficult to believe that they belonged to the same person. But the difference is in the line of progression towards a higher and better condition. And while he, with other Old Testament saints, does not come up to the standard by which one occupying the same degree of prominence under the New Testament dispensation is to be measured, he is not on that account to be condemned as unworthy of the station he filled, nor are the wisdom and holiness of God to be pronounced defective. On the contrary the heroes of the Old Testament are living examples, forever demonstrating the power of God to judge what is in a man.

But we turn to that beautiful picture of unaffected faith which stands out prominently above every other, namely: Abraham's offering of his only son Isaac. The prompt and

willing obedience of Abraham to the command of God won for him the title: "Father of the Faithful." His was indeed an heroic faith worthy of all respect and imitation. We need not wonder that it has been held up as an example to stimulate and encourage the faith of all succeeding generations. But, as is the case with all events of real significance, the circumstance has been appealed to by religious fanatics as sanctioning the most extravagant acts of physical torture and even the destruction of life, as meritorious acts of religious worship. Others object to the whole narrative as fatal to the doctrine of God's righteousness and justice, and hold that God's command to Abraham to offer his son as a burnt offering, involves his character in glaring immorality. It was a hard command, but there are times and occasions when hard commands are necessary. They generally come in great crises, when everything is at stake, and when a single cast of the die, as it were, determines the future for good or evil. We to-day would not obey such a command, no matter whence it came; nor could there be any occasion for such a command. Happily the Christian mind of to-day understands the character of God better. It knows that He does not desire the sacrifice of human blood, that He does not delight in burnt offerings. Who to-day under any circumstances would not rather lay down his own life than cast a beloved child into the fire, even as an act of worship? But there is a vast distance between the time of Abraham and the present; a distance which is measured not only in terms of years, but by centuries of moral and spiritual growth.

Many efforts have been made to explain the narrative in such a way as to make it harmonize with the acknowledged necessary moral character of God. The principle underlying many, if not most of the explanations is, that God being the Creator and preserver of human life has a right to deal with it in any manner pleasing to Himself. But this is obviously destructive of morality. God can do all things, but He cannot contradict Himself. Having created man as a free agent, capable of originating action and of self-determination, He is

compelled by those terms to treat him in a manner consistent with rational and moral freedom.

In what did the trial of Abraham's faith consist? and what was the lesson which the Lord meant to teach him? This is the question which calls for an answer.

Abraham had recently been called and separated from his kindred and nation, who were not only an idolatrous people, but practiced the offering of human sacrifices. He was still surrounded by Canaanite tribes, who customarily sacrificed children on the altars of their heathen gods. Abraham and his wife stood alone in the midst of an idolatrous world. The idea and the practice of sacrificing children were therefore perfectly familiar to him, and the simple offering of a child could not have had a very disquieting effect upon Abraham's mind. But a son had been given to him in his old age, after the hope of posterity was dead within him, and he had been promised that through that son his offspring should become as the stars of heaven for multitude, and that in him and his seed the nations of the earth should be blessed. Isaac was that son of promise, and Abraham's great trial consisted, not in the act of offering a child in sacrifice to his God, a thing familiar to his experience, but in the giving up of an only son in whom alone the possibilities of posterity and the promised blessings were comprehended. It, therefore, involved complete self-renunciation and a firm trust in the faithfulness and power of his God in some way to fulfill His word. It must have been a dark and trying hour for Abraham. And, although we feel that he made the sacrifice of a child no matter of conscience, yet we who have been honored with the confiding love of children can sympathize with him as he leads his child, his only one, on whom he was already leaning, and whose life gives promise and hope for the future, up the ascent to the place appointed for the offering. We cannot forget that Abraham came to a decision to obey without any human counsel or support. His was, indeed, a great faith; it was the faith of a hero, a pioneer, through whom a new ethical era was ushered into the world. Well may he

receive the crowning title: Father of the Faithful and be remembered as an example of child-like trust by successive generations down to the end of time.

As to the objective transaction, we quote the following from Oehler's *Old Testament Theology*, page 64: "The culminating point of worship in the religions of nature was human sacrifice. The covenant religion had to separate itself in this respect from heathenism; the truth in it had to be acknowledged and the falsehood denied. In the command to offer up Isaac the truth of the conviction that human life must be sacrificed as an unholy thing is acknowledged; and by the arresting intervention of God the hideous distortion of this truth, which had arisen in heathenism, is condemned and rejected." It was an educational command which Abraham received, and the lesson he was taught helped to correct his misapprehension of God, and imparted to him the important truth that He who had called him did not desire, nor require of him the sacrifice of human blood, but the consecration of his life to serve the ends of righteousness and purity. The discipline was severe, but it served its purpose and never needed to be repeated. In this event we observe one of those great moral uplifts by which the race was brought into a higher condition of moral consciousness; that is, to a fuller and truer apprehension of the character of God, of the aim and end of human life, and of personal responsibility for the success of its mission. That sporadic cases of human sacrifice occurred in the subsequent history of Israel there can be no doubt (2 King 16:3; 17:17; 21:6); but they can always be traced to heathen Canaanite influences; and those who practiced them were regarded as having departed from the ethical polity of the divine covenant. Such cases were exceptional, and exhibit the power of the tendency of human nature to degradation in spite of the divine teaching and discipline, and the influence of the evil example furnished by the wicked practices of godless neighbors or associates.

Consider, in the next place, the terrible, wholesale destruction of the rebels, Korah, Dathan and Abiram, with their families and all others associated with them.

With great difficulty Moses had brought the children of Israel to the borders of the promised land; for they had in various ways and on numerous occasions proved themselves to be a refractory people, dissatisfied, stubborn, suspicious, and, as the event under consideration shows, ambitious of power and office. With the exception of two, the persons sent in advance to spy out the land brought back an unfavorable report concerning it. The two who urged the people to go forward and possess themselves of the land narrowly escaped being stoned to death. The general dissatisfaction of the people was conducive to the scheme which the conspirators had in view, namely, to depose Moses and Aaron and take the leadership into their own hands. What their further scheme was, whether to lead the people back to Egypt, as had been proposed after hearing the report of the spies, or to take them elsewhere, does not appear. Like most persons of selfish ambitions, they probably had no purpose or plan in view except to put themselves into positions of honor and power. But evidently matters had reached a crisis. The divine authority under which Moses acted was set at defiance and had to be maintained at any price, or the efforts to save the race be given up. It was: onward to Canaan, the land of promise and freedom, no matter what obstacles lie in the way or how circuitous the route, or back to Egypt and eternal bondage.

It is not against the severe punishment of the arch-conspirators that the Christian feelings protest; but against the wholesale slaughter of innocent women and children, the destruction of whole families on account of the transgressions of single members. This seems to be carrying the administration of justice to an extreme which could only defeat its proper ends. To-day such a course of procedure would not be tolerated. It would bring about a reaction against those in authority that would sweep them with equal violence from their positions as unfit to rule. To-day the law and the court try the individual charged with wrongdoing, and if, after trial, he is found guilty, due punishment is meted out to him only. But, as already remarked, there is a long

course of upward training between then and now. Then individual responsibility was not yet clearly defined and men did not yet discriminate between the transgressor and his family. Such is the unity and solidarity of the race that the sense of individual obligation and responsibility cannot develop in advance of the moral consciousness of the family, the tribe, or the nation. There is a law of being and an order of development that cannot be contravened or disregarded. As the members of the body grow out of the body and develop *pari passu* with the body, they become increasingly capable of discharging separate and specific functions. In all respects—in moral no less than in intellectual and physical culture—the individual conscience rests in a bosom of powers conducive to its growth; in short the individual conscience is dependent upon the moral life of the community or state. It is true that the morality of the individual, like the physical member, will exert a reflex influence upon the communal life; but, nevertheless, the true order of development is, in the nature of things, as here represented. God could not, therefore, begin the training of the race with the training of its members individually; it would have been a superficial training on the periphery of life and would have fostered anarchy and separatism. Those who to-day labor for the subversion of existing social and religious institutions, professedly in the interest of the individual, only show how little they are capable of appreciating the broad principles which underlie human society. Not so God; He chose the family, the real unit of the race, to start with; and from this He advances to the tribe and the nation. It is this idea of the race which, on the human side, controls and limits the method of development. It is the binding and conserving power of its authority, as well as the authority of the divine command "to go forward," that, in the event under consideration, had to be preserved. Hence the singling out and punishment of the arch-conspirators would not have met all the requirements. The lesson would not have made the impression which was needed. The individual conscience was not sufficiently developed to

profit by any chastisement short of great calamities. Violent and destructive outbursts of wrath and hatred against sin were needed, in those days, to impress the people with the magnitude of the offense and the resultant jeopardy into which it thrust all human interests.

But notwithstanding the apparently cruel severity inflicted upon so many on the occasion referred to, we see unmistakable evidences, too, that the morality of the Hebrews was then already far in advance of that of the heathen, which had remained stationary. The heathen still continued to sacrifice human victims. Their rulers still had at their arbitrary disposal the lives of their subjects. The ruler had it in his sovereign power, for any cause or no cause, to cruelly mutilate, torture, or fling into the fire whole families, if he chose to do so. Life was the mere sport of his capricious will, exercised without reference to altruistic ends or future good. But it was no longer so in Israel. Israel already had a code, according to which justice was far more equitably and adequately administered amongst them than amongst the heathen. The case of the rebels was extraordinary, and could not be dealt with by the ordinary methods which had obtained the sanction of experience; it demanded extraordinary treatment. But Moses and Aaron did not presume to act on their own responsibility. They appealed to heaven, and then acted in accordance with what they understood to be the divine will and pleasure. At such critical times, with no precedent to guide them, they did not even venture to assume absolute power and authority.

From that time on we hear of no more rebellions, and the journey, though prolonged, is steadily continued towards Canaan.

Another similar case of severe punishment is that of Achan. The same principles apply in this case. The sin of Achan was different from that of Korah and his co-conspirators, but it occurred at an equally critical period in the history of Israel and of the whole human race; for the welfare of the race was at the time bound up with the success or failure of Israel. The

people had, in obedience to the divine command, entered the holy land; their feet were treading the ground that was to be hallowed by driving out the heathen, by destroying and breaking in pieces his idolatrous altars and rearing altars to the God of Israel. Jericho had fallen, and the Hebrews were going forth to the conquest of Ai. Surrounded on every side by enemies, it was of the utmost importance that they should maintain strict discipline and bend all their energies to the conquest of the land. Israel was not called to become a band of plunderers, but to become a settled, well-organized community; to become consolidated into a nation for the development of moral and spiritual virtues. One of the essentials requisite for this was a land, a country of their own. Nothing could have been more dangerous to a people acting in the capacity of an army, and practically within the territory of an enemy, than to allow individuals to abandon the prosecution of the important work in hand, in order to gratify their greed for plunder. To have let Achan's offense pass without prompt and adequate punishment as a salutary lesson to all Israel, would have been putting a premium on egoism of the worst kind. The probability is that, under the sway of the passion for selfish gain, the people would have become totally demoralized, when disorganization and dispersion would have followed; and Israel, dispersed, would have fallen an easy prey to the surrounding enemies, and so have failed of the end of its calling. Here again the Lord brought the race through a narrow pass on its way to final deliverance. It was done at the cost of much suffering and of many apparently innocent lives, but it was better that many should perish than that the whole cause should perish. The punishment was what the times demanded and justified. The people made no objection, and the writers recorded the events without a word of criticism.

In the same way the exterminating wars which the Jews waged can be justified. Every one knows that in time of war measures are used and things are done which could not be justified in time of peace. In our day the suspension of

"habeas corpus," the levying of extraordinary taxes and import duties, the incidental destruction of personal property, the occupation and devastation of land are some of the oppressive features of war which fall alike upon the good and the bad, the guilty and the innocent. That wars have been necessary for the settlement of disputes and the maintenance of the right cannot be gainsaid. The preservation of the life of a nation must be held to be of more value for the race than the preservation of any private interests. But to practice cruelties, or to cause unnecessary sufferings, is condemned by the moral judgment of Christian civilization. The destruction of life and property, especially of non-combatants, is in modern warfare deprecated and, if possible, avoided. Only so far as it is necessary to the maintenance of a just cause, does the present moral sense of the civilized world justify even the destruction of property. It was not so in the times when Israel drove the heathen Canaanites out of Palestine. And even here we find some advance upon previous times and upon heathen customs. The heathen tortured their prisoners, and even mutilated the bodies of the slain. Israel is at one time commanded to cut down palm trees and to destroy olive groves (2 Kin. 3: 19), but afterwards this barbarous custom was forbidden (Deut. 20: 19).

It is idle to say that God might in some miraculous way have given the Israelites the land they were to occupy. According to the principles already stated, God could not have done this without contradicting Himself and destroying human freedom. He can be a light and a help to His people, but He cannot by a species of supernaturalism forestall man in his own proper sphere of subjugating the earth, which has become more than doubly difficult through the fall. By so doing He would have atrophied man's intellectual and moral powers instead of developing them; in fact it would have resulted in failure on the part of God to save the race. No, we are shut up to the fact that God did the best that could be done; and that His counsel and His discipline were effectual for the development of Israel's moral consciousness, its sense of duty, of

obligation and responsibility. There is no good that comes into the possession of man except that which is won by his own labor and by serious conflicts with opposing powers. The land that Israel won for itself cost less blood and treasure than perhaps any other that was at all available would have cost. The nations outside of Palestine were more numerous and better organized and equipped to maintain a struggle. The tribes that occupied the several districts of Palestine were more or less independent of each other; they lacked cohesion and centralization under one ruling head; hence they were less able to make any united or protracted resistance.

It is the ultimate outcome, the redemption and salvation of the race, that justifies the incidental suffering attending the struggle. This is, however, not the jesuitical principle that the end sanctifies the means, that one may do evil that good may result. It is the principle that whenever action is necessary one must do the very best thing he can do under the circumstances. And action was necessary; the very best thing possible under the circumstances had to be done or the idea of salvation abandoned altogether.

Are the innocent who perished in the conflict to be compensated for the evils they suffered? In order to fully justify the moral character of God, we are logically driven to the conclusion that God, who is absolutely holy and righteous, who cannot tolerate any injustice, will, at some time, give those who have innocently suffered in this life and who were prematurely cut down in the general destruction attending necessary conflicts for the maintenance of truth, an opportunity of declaring themselves, and in the final consummation and judgment of the world bestow upon them the rewards they merit. If we believe that sin is not punished simply because it is sin, but for the good of man, then we must believe, too, that those who perished in conflicts which were not brought on and could not be averted by them, must receive some recognition of their rights as free moral agents.

That there should be defects in the Mosaic legislation, viewed

from our present standpoint, ought not to be a matter of surprise. It is a thing of frequent occurrence to find that laws at one time necessary and eminently serviceable were at a later period modified, or repealed, or, becoming inoperative on account of the changed condition of things, were allowed to remain as dead letters upon the statute books of nations. Civil laws suited to all times and places cannot be formulated after the pattern of any moral ideal, however perfect, and then imposed upon a people. They necessarily have their origin in the circumstances and consciously felt needs of the times. Consequently, laws suited to the ruder conditions of society are either modified or left behind as civilization advances. It would be interesting to draw a detailed comparison between the "First Legislation," or "Book of the Covenant," found in Exodus,* and the Deuteronomic code, contained in Deuteronomy, in order to show what changes had taken place within Israel, and what advance beyond the surrounding Canaanite heathenism Israel had made in the time which elapsed between the giving of the two codes; but we must content ourselves with a brief notice of only a few of the imperfections charged against the Mosaic legislation.

In the earlier legislation, the principles of civil and criminal justice were retaliation and pecuniary compensation. The same law, it is alleged, is still practiced among the Arabs of the desert. It was "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand," etc. The law grew out of a rude state of society, and answered its needs. But in the Deuteronomic legislation, we perceive that a general advance has been made. The law of retaliation is limited to the false witness. In the earlier legislation the offender betakes himself to the sanctuary, "but the tribunal of the sanctuary is only arbiter, not executive."† In the later legislation, "the sanctuary is still the highest seat of law, but the priest is now associated with a supreme civil judge

*Ex. ch. xix. xxiii.

† The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, (Smith) p. 337.

(Deut. xvii. 9, 12) who seems to be identical with the king"* The laws of Israel are at no time ideal laws, applicable always and everywhere. "But the growth of customs and usage is on the whole upward, and ancient social usages which survived for many centuries after the age of Josiah among the heathen of Arabia and Syria already lie behind the Deuteronomic code. With all the hardness of Israel's heart, the religion of Jehovah had proved in its influence on the nation a better religion than that of the Baalim." †

The lax laws of Moses concerning marriage and divorce, it is true, would to-day prove destructive instead of preservative of the family. But history does not move backward. And their enactment at the time is evidence of the fact that they were intended to regulate and reform the still grosser customs and usages of antecedent times. They served their purpose well in their day, and then passed away, being superseded by others better adapted to the higher conditions of life which grew into existence under their sway. One law begins where another ends, and they, like the nodes in a plant, mark the stages of growth from the rude forms of primitive life towards the Christian ideal.

God chose the family as the unit of the race and made it the basis of social and national life. However imperfect it was to begin with, there is a steady progress towards its elevation and purification. At last it becomes the crowning beauty and glory of Israel. The family life of Joseph and Mary is characterized by the purest love and devotion. In it is found at last an atmosphere of religious and moral culture worthy of being honored with the care and training of the blessed child Jesus. In no other institution could God so well prepare the minds of His people to apprehend the idea of the fatherhood of God. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him." Woman gradually acquires her rightful position. It is the son of the free woman that is to be heir of the promise. And to-day it is the Christian family which, as a fountain of purity and religious power, conserves the life of the

* *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, (Smith) p. 387. † *Ibid.*, 389.

nation and of the race. No speedier way to the destruction of existing social, political, and religious institutions could be found than by removing the safeguards of the family and destroying its unity.

If the progress of moral development was slow, it was so, not because God's love for His people at any time failed, but on account of man's slowness to learn and apply the lessons of truth. But God understood the people with whom He had to deal, and He graciously condescended to temper the discipline of instruction and punishment to their capacities and needs. Slow as was the progress, it still was progress. The men whom God chose, and the nation, acquired in time a just conception of Him, a deep conviction of sin, an ardent desire for forgiveness and for fellowship with God. "Out of the depths have I cried to Thee, O Lord." The prophets realize at last and teach the people that what the Lord wants is not the sacrifices of beasts, but the consecration of the heart. "A contrite heart Thou wilt not despise." And so the world was prepared for the coming of Christ. We can truly say that the moral consciousness of to-day is the outgrowth, the result, of long ages of training. The continuity can be traced. Across the plane of time the moral development of Israel forms the one bright line. Faint at first, it grows brighter as it approaches the eternal star from which it emanates and towards which it leads. If it is at times dimmed by the unbelief and corruption of the masses, it is again brightly illumined by the faith and obedience of a "remnant" led by the prophets, who proclaim in ever-clearer tones the love and purpose of God.

When we reflect upon the corruption and violence that has been perpetrated within the blazing light of Christianity, and even in its name, by popes, kings and emperors, we can appreciate the forbearance and long-suffering, the wisdom and power of God, in holding up the life of Israel against the tremendous downward pressure of the tendency in humanity to gravitate back to heathenism. And though at times, as at the exile, the masses fall away into destruction, there is always preserved a kernel of good which becomes the seed of a more advanced growth.

VII.

PAUL BEFORE HIS CONVERSION.

(Translated from Godel's *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, Vol. I.,
Les Épîtres de Saint Paul.)

BY REV. HENRY S. GEKELEN.

THE city of Tarsus in Cilicia, in which the apostle was born,* was at that time one of the most brilliant centres of culture of the Greek world. For literary life and for scientific institutions, Tarsus rivalled Athens and Alexandria.†

We do not know when and on what occasion the family of Paul had been established in this city. *Jerome* claimed that they were originally from the town of Giscala, in Judea (for Galilee), and that after the birth of Paul they had emigrated to Cilicia upon the ruin of that city by the Romans.‡ But Giscala was not taken until 67,§ sixty years at least after the birth of the apostle and probably the year of his death. This is an error so great that one does not know how to explain it. Is it necessary to suppose a capture of that city by the Romans which preceded the war properly speaking, and of which history makes no mention? Such a supposition is scarcely admissible. The basis of truth which motived that statement reduces itself

* Acts 9: 11; 21: 39; 22: 3,—“I am a Jew, born in Tarsus of Cilicia.”

† Paul himself says, Acts 21: 39, “A citizen of no mean city.” *Xenophon*, *Anab.* I: 2, 23, “A city great and prosperous.” Comp. also *Strabo* 14: 4, 5 (the zeal of Tarsians for philosophy and every species of culture).

‡ *De Vir. illustr.* at word *Paulus*: “From which (Giscala), when it had been captured by the Romans, he emigrated with his parents to Tarsus, a city of Cilicia;” and *ad Philem.* 5: 23.

§ *Josephus*, *Bell. Jud.* V. 2, 5.

doubtless to this fact, that Paul's family was originally from that city of Galilee, now called El-jisch.

If at the moment of his conversion Paul was already at least thirty years old, as we shall establish later, and if that event took place about the year 36 or 37 A. D., as is probable, we are compelled to fix about the year 7 of our era as the date of his birth, when Jesus, aged ten or eleven years, was still working with his father in the shop at Nazareth.

On the day of his circumcision the babe received the name Saul, or Saül, which signifies *the desired*. Perhaps that birth had been the object of long waiting. But perhaps also this name originated in that of the first King of Israel, who was of the tribe to which the family of Saul belonged.* As Israelites living in Gentile lands usually added to their Jewish name a Greek or Roman name, and generally chose one which by its sound approached nearest to the former (*e. g.*, a Jew called Jesus became Jason, etc.), it is probable that the name Paul was given him as the Latin transformation of his Hebrew name. There has been a desire to find in this name an allusion to his mean appearance (*παῦλος*, the small, *παυρος*, the feeble), or indeed a homage rendered to the Proconsul Sergius Paulus, Governor of Cyprus (Acts 13:7). It is, in short, at the moment of that magistrate's conversion that the use of the name Paul begins in Acts. But Paul was not a courtier, and it is more probable that this name began to be given to him at that stage of the story, because then the career of apostle to the Gentiles was really opened to him.

The family of Paul was in possession of a right which at that epoch was considered a sort of dignity, that of Roman citizen. It is absolutely without reason that Zeller, Overbeck, Renan, etc., have suspected this statement of the Acts; it is to this fact that the appeal of the apostle, so decisive, to the imperial tribunal attaches itself, and by the same thing his journey to Rome and residence there are explained.† History at that time

* Rom. 11:1; Phil. 3:5,—“Of the tribe of Benjamin.”

† Acts 16:37; 22:25, 28.

presents many instances of Jews endowed with Roman citizenship, especially among the Jews of Asia Minor, and particularly those of Ephesus, Sardis, Tarsus, etc.*

From his earliest training Paul was placed under the dominion of Pharisaism to which his family belonged from father to son.† To what extent, in the midst of such a family, could he receive during the first years of his life the influence of the surrounding Greek culture? We do not know. It is probable that the effect produced upon the soul of the young Pharisee by the polytheism of Tarsus was not that of attraction, but on the contrary that of a profound repulsion. The leaven of idolatry which permeated the entire Greek life must have inspired disgust in his young heart, even as the spectacle of Athenian polytheism did later in spite of its artistic beauty. Nevertheless it is not possible that a soul as open as his should have been entirely insensible to the Greek spirit and art, and that these means should not to a certain point have prepared him for his future mission better than a strictly Jewish limitation would have done.

It was in general at the age of twelve that the young Israelite commenced to be subjected to the observance of the law, and when he became, as it is called, *bar mitsva*, a son of the commandment; not that religious instruction began at that age. Philo and Josephus agree in saying that from the tenderest age the young Israelites were instructed in the law by their parents

* Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 10, 13-19, several times, "Jewish citizens of Rome," or "Our Jewish citizens" (in the mouth of Roman magistrates). I find an interesting notice on this subject in Le Camus' *L'œuvre des apôtres*, I, p. 136. In the war of Brutus and Cassius against Augustus and Antony, Tarsus, having taken the part of the latter, saw itself forced at a certain moment to open its gates to Cassius. To avenge himself he sold a great number of the inhabitants into slavery. But those who arrived in Rome were set free after the victory of Augustus, and were able to return to their own country with the title of Roman citizens. Among these Tarsians, returned to their own land, there was found doubtless a certain number of Jewish families (cf. *Bell. civ.* IV. 64; V. 7). The same writer goes still further and supposes that the Roman name *Paulus* arose in the family of Paul from the illustrious Roman family of that name, which had enfranchised the father of the child.

† Acts 23: 6,—"I am a Pharisee, a son of a Pharisee."

and masters, so that they would respond more quickly to a question on the commandments than to give their own name.* But it was from that moment that the law, moral and ritual, became the rule of their personal life, and it was also at that age that Paul went to live at Jerusalem. He had in that city a married sister.† His parents, who could not have helped seeing his rare talents, had destined him for the profession of rabbi. To that end he was placed under the direction of the most illustrious doctor of the times, Gamaliel,‡ whom the Jews have named the "splendor of the law." He it is who must have been the first to receive the title of Rabban ("our rabbi"). Upon the basis of a tradition which must have originated with a son of Gamaliel himself, named Simon, the Talmud accounts that he had 1000 disciples, of whom 500 studied the Law and 500 Greek wisdom (philosophy and literature) under his direction.§ This liberty which was accorded him of teaching a foreign literature at Jerusalem, proves the exceptional confidence which he enjoyed. The prudent counsel which he uttered in the Sanhedrim at the trial of the apostles (Acts 5:34 ff.), shows the wise circumspection that distinguished him. It is by no means correct to suspect the recital in Acts, because of the contrast between the conduct of the master and that of his disciple. Disciples do not always inherit the moderation of their masters.

What the young Saul was as a student we learn from his own mouth in the Epistle to the Galatians. Not only did he surpass all his fellow-disciples in knowledge of the law and of the traditions of the fathers, but his conduct was in sympathy with his theological zeal; he was in the first rank as to *Judaism*, i. e., as to the practice of Mosaic and Pharisaic observances. He tells us himself what was the end he pursued in dealing

* See Schüner, *Lehrb. des Neutest. Zeitgesch.* 2d ed., Vol. II., p. 353.

† Acts 23:16,—"Paul's sister's son"

‡ Acts 22:3, "Brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers."

§ See Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des bibl. Alterthums*, at word Gamaliel.

thus. He desired above all to attain the ideal of holiness traced in the law, in order to satisfy the conditions required by God to grant to a man the title of just. He resembled that young rich man of the Gospel who wished to know the work necessary to render him perfect. Doubtless a certain ambition, an immoderate desire to obtain the approbation of his superiors, as well as the prospect of arriving at one of those high positions so coveted among the Jews, which eminent rabbis occupied, as his master Gamaliel, mingled itself also in his pious zeal; he recognized, indeed, later the impure alloy which sullied his former righteousness. But this is no reason to deny the noble aspiration which animated that young heart in his incessant intellectual and moral labor, as well as the elevation of the end he proposed to himself.

Alongside of his theological studies, he learned a trade by means of which he might be able one day to make his living. For rabbis must be able to teach gratuitously, and Gamaliel declared that the study of the law, when it was not accompanied by another kind of work, leads to sin.* That trade was, according to Acts 18: 3, that of "tent-maker" (*σκηνοποιός*). The meaning of the term is uncertain. Some see in it the trade of weaver; the work of Paul would have consisted in weaving the coarse cloth which was made from the hair of Cilician goats; it would thus have corresponded with the native land of the apostle. But the expression conducts rather to the idea, to-day more generally adopted, of work which consisted in making the tents themselves, by means of the fabric we have just spoken of. It was thus the work of a tailor rather than of a weaver. The Greek fathers (Chrysostom, Theodoret, etc.) considered Paul's trade still a little differently. It would consist, according to them, in shaping the hides of animals to make tents of, or cases in which to transport tents; in this event it would be the work of a saddler.†

The subsequent history will show of what use for the apostle-

* Cf. Ecclesiastics 51: 27 and Pirke Aboth 2: 2.

† See Hug, Einl. II., § 79.

late of Paul that means was, which he had acquired in his youth, of providing for his own support.*

May we suppose that to his rabbinical erudition Saul united in some measure the knowledge of Greek literature? If this was so, it would assuredly not be necessary to trace back this species of study even to the time of his childhood passed at Tarsus before his residence at Jerusalem. For whatever may have been the precocity of his intelligence, he was still too young to have made himself then already a Greek among the Greeks. But at Jerusalem, in the school of Gamaliel, he may well have been able, after what has been said, to receive a certain knowledge of Greek authors, whose language he already possessed. Then, when he came back to Tarsus, between his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion and his first missionary journey with Barnabas, and when he made his residence there for several years, it is inconceivable that he should have remained a stranger to the intellectual surroundings in the midst of which he then lived. He was then about thirty-five years old; he had all the energy and fire of youth, awaiting the moment when the Lord should call him to commence his work of evangelization in the Greek world, and he would keep himself from what might be most useful in accomplishing that task! It is not conceivable—at least he was another man altogether than the one whom his life and activity have made known to us. If then we find in his letter citations of Greek writers, we must not be astonished. There are three such: that of *Menander*, a poet of comedy of the third century before Christ, from whom Paul quotes the words (1 Cor. 15: 33): "Evil company doth corrupt good manners"; the second is from *Epimenides*, a Cretan poet, from whom he cites that characterization of his compatriots (Tit. 1: 12): "Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons"; lastly the words quoted in the discourse at Athens (Acts 17: 28), which we find in two poets: in *Aratus*, a Cilician writer of the third century before

* Cf. 1 Thess. 2: 9; 2 Thess. 3: 8; 1 Cor. 4: 12; 2 Cor. 12: 14; Acts 20: 34, 35.

Christ, who says in his *Phenomena* V, 5: "We all stand greatly in need of Zeus, for we are his race," and (a second time) in the story of *Cleanthus*, in the *Hymn to Jupiter*: "For we are thy race" (*ἐξ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν*), and in the *Golden Poem*: "For mortals are of a race divine" (*θεῖον γὰρ γένος ἐστὶ βροτοῖσιν*).

Schaff cites besides that word of *Pindar** (*Nem. VI.*): "Men and gods are of a single race; we both draw our breath from the same mother."

Most of the critics, *Renan*, *Weiss*, etc., claim that these citations of the apostle are taken by him from popular usage, and in no wise prove his acquaintance with the writings indicated above. "These words," says M. Renan, "circulated in all mouths like proverbs."† Strictly, this supposition might fit the first two citations which have, at least that of Menander, the character of current maxims. But it certainly fails in regard to the third. For Paul cites here expressly a plurality of authors: *some of your poets*. His acquaintance with the two latter then must be acknowledged, and these two we know also by their works and by their names. And what confirms the view that Paul was really acquainted with them, is, as Schaff has observed, that Paul has even preserved the particle *for*, which would be displaced in a proverbial maxim, and which belongs positively to the two texts of Aratus and Cleanthus.

Assuredly I should not hence conclude the astonishing erudition which has sometimes been attributed to the apostle. But I see in this fact the proof quite certain that at the moment when he pushed out into a domain like the Greek world, which he wished to subject to Jesus Christ, like a true rival of Alexander, Paul in no wise neglected what might assure him of success in that immense conquest.

The apostle speaks (2 Cor. 12: 7) of a thorn which he carried in the flesh, of a messenger of Satan, which had been given him to buffet him, in order that he should not be puffed up by

* History of the Chr. Ch., Vol. I. p. 289 ff.

† Les Apôtres, p. 167.

reason of his revelations. These expressions must designate an evil that manifested itself under the form of violent crises, sudden, and calculated to humiliate profoundly the person who was attacked by them. Is it necessary, as is ordinarily done, to identify this mysterious evil with the malady of which Paul makes mention in his Epistle to the Galatians (4: 13): "You know that because of an infirmity in the flesh I preached the Gospel unto you the first time?" It follows from these words that the foundation of the Church in Galatia was occasioned by an illness which retained the apostle in this country which he had wished only to cross (Acts 16: 6). Since the Apostle proceeds feelingly to describe the intense love which the Galatians had then testified to him by saying that instead of turning from him with contempt and disgust (literally with disdain and spitting), "Ye would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me if that were possible;" a number of critics have concluded that the evil in question not only in the Epistle to the Galatians, but also in that to the Corinthians, was an acute ophthalmia (Rückert, Nyegard, * Farrar†). These writers besides lay stress on Gal. 6: 11, in which they apply the term *πῆλιστα γράμματα* to the greatness of the letters with which Paul had been compelled to write his epistle, because of his inability to see well. It is believed possible, finally, to discover the origin of that infirmity in the blindness with which he was attacked after the luminous apparition on the road to Damascus. Thence the imagination gives itself wings. Thus Mr. Farrar has depicted the lamentable existence of the apostle, obliged to let himself be led about constantly by one of his companions. Aside from the identification, probably erroneous, of that evil which arrested him in Galatia with that of which he speaks in Corinthians, I cannot view that hypothesis of illness of the eyes as likely. The expression by which Paul describes the affection, so lively, which the Galatians testified for him during his first residence among them, proves nothing; for it is an

* *Revue Chrétienne*, March, 1878.

† *Life of Saint Paul*, I, p. 652-661.

image often employed to designate the sacrifice of that which is dearest to one in favor of another tenderly beloved. The sense given to the expression *πῆλιστα γράμματα*, applied to the greatness of character with which Paul had written his letter, gives to that word a ridiculous meaning. That expression applies very naturally to the length of the letter itself, written altogether in the apostle's own hand, contrary to the habit he had of dictating his letters. Besides, the Epistle to Philemon (v. 19) proves that when he wished to do so, he himself wrote, and that about matters infinitely less grave than a letter to a church.* We see, Acts 20: 13,† that he sometimes accorded himself the pleasure of traveling alone on foot; this it is at least which appears to follow from the opposition between *Paul* and *us* (his companion). Some remaining trace of his blindness is difficult to admit after the miraculous healing which he had received from the Lord by the intervention of Ananias. Finally we absolutely do not see how a disease of the eyes could have had the repulsive and disgusting character of which Paul speaks in Galatians (if the two maladies are distinct), nor how (if they be identified) an evil of this nature could be likened in Corinthians to buffets of an invisible hand which suddenly attacks and strikes down a man in the midst of his activity.

Others have thought with more likelihood, it seems to me, of a nervous trouble of the nature of epilepsy. It must be acknowledged that such a disease, which suddenly reduces a man to a state of unconsciousness, accompanied by symptoms most painful to contemplate, answers much better to the expression employed by the apostle in the Epistle to the Corinthians. This supposition also agrees, up to a certain point, with the expression of Galatians. But what is absolutely opposed to this explanation in the latter epistle, is the context: a fit of epilepsy

* "If he have wronged thee at all, put it to my account: I Paul write it with mine own hand, I will repay it."

† "But we going before to the ship set sail for Assos, there intending to take in Paul; for so had he appointed, intending himself to go on foot" (margin).

is passed at the end of one or two days, often in a few hours; it could not then have occasioned a prolonged suspension of Paul's journey. It might also be asked if the immense intellectual and physical activity shown by him without abatement during three decades, would be compatible with such violent cerebral crises. *Krenkel*, the most able defender of this view, replies by the examples of Julius Cæsar, Mahomet, Napoleon I., Milton, etc.* In any case it is not necessary to identify that chronic ailment with the temporary illness which retained Paul in Galatia. If they are distinguished, as I think ought to be done, we might be led to the following supposition. The permanent trouble, but appearing under the form of sudden fits, mentioned in Corinthians, might be that by which certain preachers have been affected, a cramp which suddenly deprives them of speech in the midst of their discourse, and leaves them stammering, and with a sort of rattle in the throat. We can imagine the profound humiliation which an apostle must have experienced to be suddenly smitten with dumbness before an audience that hung upon his words and was ready to cry out: "The voice of a god, and not of a man!" As to the temporary illness that stopped him in Galatia, we might think, by reason of its repulsive and even disgusting character, of a cutaneous eruption which covered his body and countenance with rash or ulcers during a certain number of weeks.

The Jews marry early, and it might be asked if Saul, having attained the age of thirty years at least at his conversion, was not or had not been married. *Clement of Alexandria*, *Erasmus* and others have thought that by the term *συ δούλος*, Phil. 4:3, Paul designated his wife (who according to Renan would be no other than Lydia, the seller of purple, the first convert of the church at Philippi). They forget that the epithet *ἄνθρωπος* is masculine, and besides that the duties of conjugal life, such as Paul understood them according to 1 Cor. 7, would have been incompatible with the requirements of a missionary life. Others, *Luther*, *Grotius*, *Ewald*, *Hausrath*, *Farrar*, have claimed especi-

* *Krenkel*, *Beitr. z. Aufhellung der Gesch. u. Br. des Ap. Paulus*, 1890.

ally on 1 Cor. 7: 7, 8, that he must have been a widower. For *ἀγαμοί*, not married, opposed to *χήραι*, widowed, could not, they say, designate any but widowers. I have shown in my Commentary on First Corinthians, *ad loc.*, that that reason is not well founded and that *ἀγαμοί* designates here in general all men not married, widowers or celibates. What Paul says of a special gift that was accorded him, makes us think of a state of celibacy rather than that of widowhood. Mr. Farrar proves that according to Jewish customs of the time, a parallel case would have been absolutely exceptional. But he himself cites certain doctors who on this point establish exceptions to the general rule.*

The exterior of the apostle must have been of wretched appearance. "His bodily presence is weak," said his adversaries (2 Cor. 10: 10). In Lycaonia, Acts 14: 12 ff., the multitude take Barnabas for Jupiter, and Paul for Mercury; the first had a more imposing presence than the second. But it is a long way from this to the portrait traced by *M. Renan*: "That man of short stature, bald, short-legged, corpulent, having the eyebrows joined together and a prominent nose." That is a caricature drawn from an apocryphal writing of the second century, the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, and from the *Chronicle* of Malalas of the sixth century. It was not known in the second century how the apostolate of Paul closed; all that extended beyond the end of the book of Acts was shrouded in deepest fog, and we should still possess an authentic tradition about the form of his nose and eyebrows and legs!

A question more important to know is whether at the time of his studies young Saul had occasion to see or hear Jesus during one of the sojourns which the latter made in the capital in the course of his ministry. There does not exist in the letters and discourses of Paul any trace of such a fact. It will therefore be prudent to admit that during the two years when he might have seen the Lord, he was absent from Jerusalem, perhaps in the bosom of his family, and that he did not return

* See Hausrath, *Bibellesicon*, Art. Paulus; Farrar I, p. 32.

to the city until after Pentecost, shortly before Stephen's martyrdom. *Farrar* has supposed that this time of absence was employed by him in the work of proselyting in heathen lands. *Weissäcker* and *Pfleiderer* have thrown out a similar idea, and have seen in this supposed fact a natural preparation for his subsequent apostolate. When we read Matt. 23:15,* we cannot declare this supposition inadmissible. But nothing absolutely confirms it; and the passage, Gal. 5:11;† upon which they would base it, has no bearing on the question mooted.

When we embrace with a sweeping glance all the circumstances we have just detailed, we understand fully the impression which the Apostle expressed later, when casting a look over his past life, he expressed himself thus (Gal. 1:15): "God who separated me from my mother's womb." A Jew by birth and a Pharisaical Jew; this is indeed what he must have been to know by experience that life under the law which was to serve as an envelope of the new-born Gospel, but from which he had the mission to set it free. Born in the midst of the Greek world, in one of the centres of culture the most brilliant of that epoch, this indeed also he must have been in order to possess, in spite of his native repugnance for the manner of heathen life which unfolded under his eyes,—a heart open in some measure to admire the works of ancient genius, to sympathize in some degree with the constant aspiration of the Hellenic spirit toward the possession of truth, toward the realization of the beautiful and the good. By birth a Roman citizen, finally this also he must have been in order to move more freely in the heathen world, and to find a juridical shield against the abuse of power with which the hostility of his compatriots incessantly menaced him.

Thus, by the very circumstances of his birth, Saul found himself to be the living point of union between the three principal spheres of the times, that of Jewish legalism, that of Hellenic culture, and that of Roman citizenship. To that provi-

* "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte.

† "If I still preach circumcision, why am I still persecuted?"

dential position he owed the power of preaching the Gospel on Mar's Hill at Athens, and before the imperial tribunal at Rome, as well as in the midst of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. In casting a glance backward from one of the culminating points of his apostolic career, how should he not have adored the God who had thus prepared him "from his mother's womb" for the incomparable mission which He had determined to entrust him with?

The same thing holds good for the trade which he had learned from childhood, in which he had occasion to recognize a circumstance favorable to the accomplishment of his apostolate. When, by a motive of signal delicacy (which he has revealed in chapter 9 of First Corinthians), he felt the need of rendering the preaching of the Gospel gratuitous to the Gentile churches, it was to that fact, in appearance so insignificant, that he owed the power of putting into action this generous inspiration of his heart.

In accordance with all this we may imagine what the young Pharisee must have been when he arrived at the age of virility, in the plenitude of his intellectual and moral development, in the full brilliancy of his talents and power: ardent in his faith, severe toward himself, detesting everything which appeared unworthy of God, whether without or within, uniting to an irresistible dialectic great practical ability and indefatigable perseverance, possessing besides all this at the same time the gifts of a lively contemplation and of a sensibility most delicate. Make a synthesis of that choice nature, and imagine all these qualities so various developed in that one man to an uncommon degree, and you will have an idea of what Saul was at the moment when he was called to the role which he was destined to fill on the stage of history.*

* Compare the portrait which Pfeleiderer has drawn of Paul, *Das Urchristenthum*. He speaks of him undoubtedly as an apostle; but the traits indicated suppose some analogous predispositions already in the man: "A sympathy disinterested and a power of devotion which are only rarely found with men of action, and which ordinarily are the privilege of only the most noble natures among women."

VIII.

BISHOP COLEMAN ON EPISCOPAL CLAIMS.

BY REV. C. CORT, D.D.

THE following extract I have copied from the Burlington (Vt.) *Daily Free Press* for February 3, 1894, where it is given as part of a sermon delivered on the previous day by Bishop Coleman of Delaware, at the consecration of Rev. A. C. Hall, the newly-elected Bishop of Vermont:

"The preacher then gave a number of extracts from the royal charters granted to the earliest Colonists, showing how it was that in the beginning this country was colonized for Christianity, and, further, for that form of Christianity which was found in the Church of England.

"From this historical review he drew the conclusion that the Episcopal Church was in a very responsible way entrusted with the religious life of the whole nation. As to the question of priority of our services, there is no reason to doubt even as to New England. It is quite true, and the fact has a significance which all the more bears me out in my argument, that for two centuries the Church was only in name, and yet, in wonderful loyalty, Episcopal. Her preservation without the Episcopate, and yet without heresy and schism, through so long and so critical a period, deserves to rank amongst the most remarkable overrulings of Divine Providence in the ecclesiastical history of any age."

The sermon, to which this extract belongs, was delivered in the presence of a large body of Episcopal clergy from various parts of the United States and Canada, and may be considered as a good specimen of the remarkable claims set up by high churchmen in behalf of the so-called historic Episcopate. To

my mind it seems lacking in the important elements of sound logic and historic truthfulness. If any Church has a prior claim to exclusive pretensions because of original discovery and settlement of the American Continent, then the claims of the Roman Catholic hierarchy are paramount. Columbus and his immediate successors took possession of this new world in the name of Roman Catholic sovereigns, and Roman Catholic pontiffs confirmed their claims to the right of eminent domain long before the established Church of England renounced the authority of the Pope. If such claims are legally, morally and historically valid throughout all generations, then all Protestant inhabitants of America are interlopers and rebellious schismatics, to be suppressed and excluded as soon as the Holy Mother Church is able to accomplish that result. Then Roman Catholic France would still own by Divine right all of Canada and the American Continent west of the Alleghenies. Her Jesuit missionaries and pioneer explorers first discovered that vast region and took possession of it in the name of the Grand Monarch, whose great ambition was to destroy Protestantism, both in the Old World and in the New. But when Montcalm fell on the Plains of Abraham, and Forbes, with Bouquet and Washington, drove the French from the head waters of the Ohio in 1758, Roman despotism gave way to Anglo-Saxon and Protestant supremacy. And even as a matter of historical priority, the Episcopal pretensions are absurd as regards the religious status of the majority of the American Colonies. They were not settled by Church of England men, nor did they ever recognize the ecclesiastical pretensions of that body. Take Bishop Coleman's own State of Delaware. It was first settled by Swedish and Dutch colonists under the command of a German Reformed deacon, Peter Minnit, who had previously organized the government of New Amsterdam (later New York) under Dutch Reformed and Calvinistic auspices. The subsequent capture of these Colonies by the English did not destroy the prior historical and religious claims of the Protestants from the continent, if there is any validity in Bishop Coleman's

logic. And so it is with respect to the prior claims of Reformed, Baptists, Quakers, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, etc., in the settlement and organization of New York, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, etc.

These Colonies, as well as New England, were settled at first by God-fearing men, most of whom came to the New World for conscience sake, that they might have freedom to worship God in a country without a king and in a church without a bishop. It is true that this country was colonized for Christianity; but it is not true, in any proper sense, that it was colonized for that form of Christianity which was found in the Church of England, as Bishop Coleman asserts in his Burlington address. Admitting that such a claim might be made in behalf of Virginia, the character of the first settlers of that colony reflects little credit upon their mother Church or mother country. They were largely a band of shiftless adventurers, who were finally furnished with wives purchased for so many pounds of tobacco each, and were not characterized by that conscientious devotion to religious principle which animated the first settlers in more northern Colonies.

But what are we to think of the claim that New England was essentially Episcopal, for two centuries, without heresy or schism, although without the Episcopate? For that is the only meaning that we can draw from the latter part of Bishop Coleman's address as quoted above. What becomes of the historic Episcopate in the face of such declarations?

If it is like some Rocky Mountain stream which can disappear from the surface only to burst forth again hundreds of miles nearer the sea, what becomes of the laying on of Episcopal hands? If Congregationalism or Independency can preserve the true Church or the true religion "without heresy and schism" for two centuries, what need of supplementing it with Episcopal orders at this late date?

If this is historic Episcopacy why insist upon holy orders or ecclesiastical government of any particular form? Where is the historical continuity?

It is an easy matter to claim the whole earth in this style, just as the Pope of Rome claimed in his letter to William, the hoary-headed Emperor of Germany, some years ago, that all baptized persons belong to him and to his Church. The bigoted exclusiveness in one direction is only equalled by the arrogant pretensions in another. The claims of the deposed and exiled Stuarts to the throne of England, or of the successors of Philip II., of Spain, and Louis XIV., of France, to be sovereign lords of conscience over the greater part of the Old World and the New, would have been equally valid. Such methods of argument ignore the fundamental facts and principles of historical development and pervert the plain teachings of sacred Scripture. If there is any fact authenticated by history and Scripture, it is this, that no particular form of government, either for Church or State, was definitely prescribed by our Saviour and His apostles. Government of some form is a necessity, or society will go to anarchy and chaos; but what shall be the precise form of government either for Church or State, the founders of our Holy Religion never specifically defined. That is left to the choice and historical predilections of communities themselves. It is a proof of the Divine and indestructible character of Christianity, that it has flourished under all forms of government and among all classes, conditions and races of mankind. Its essence is not in any outward form of organization, but in living and personal union by faith with the Incarnate Son of God. The same principle of historical necessity that justified the establishment of the Episcopacy in England and other lands under aristocratic and monarchical forms of civil government would demand a different system of Church Government for these United States. Here the principle of representative self-government obtains, as that characterizes the polity of the different branches of the Reformed Church holding the Presbyterian system. Besides, being equally if not more scriptural than Episcopacy, the Presbyterian polity, as that prevails in the Reformed Church, corresponds with the genius of our republican institutions.

As patriotic Americans we ought to cultivate and cherish ecclesiastical organizations which embody the principles of representative Church government, if we earnestly desire to promote the safety and prosperity of the Republic. When our people come to think and act logically and consistently, they will discard the Episcopacy of expediency as well as the Episcopacy claiming exclusively Divine sanction, and make due account of the representative rights of the laity in all Church judicatories. The first Synod at Jerusalem, in which Peter, James, John and Paul took a leading part, sent forth its decrees in the joint name of the "apostles, elders, and brethren." Episcopacy as it existed when Virginia and other of the earlier Colonies were settled, did not set up the exclusive claims to apostolic succession which characterizes many of its modern adherents. The established Church of England was glad to be recognized as evangelical and orthodox by the Reformed Church of Germany and Switzerland. Reformed divines helped to purge the Book of Common Prayer from Popish elements incorporated under Henry VIII. Queen Elizabeth heartily thanked the Reformed Church of Switzerland for the asylum afforded the persecuted English Protestants during the reign of Bloody Mary. Furthermore, she took pleasure in informing the faithful and hospitable Swiss that the established Church of England taught the Reformed doctrine on the Lord's Supper.

The English Church then gladly recognized the validity of ministerial acts of Reformed divines on the Continent, and was pleased to be recognized as an orthodox branch of the Reformed and Protestant Church. The principle of religious toleration in governmental affairs was established by William the Silent, Prince of Orange, and father of the Dutch Republic. And to that illustrious example, James Madison, the father of the Constitution of the United States, appealed in advocating its adoption in our own organic law. The decisive battle of the Boyne, which overwhelmed Popery and the Stuart dynasty and secured the blessings of civil and religious liberty by constitutional

enactment as the birth-right of Englishmen, was fought mainly by Reformed soldiers from the Continent. The Brandenbergers, the Palatines, the Huguenots, along with the Dutch Regulars of William III., led by the Prince of Orange in person, and the Huguenot, Marshal Schomberg and his son Minehart, fought this grand battle for constitutional liberty and Protestant supremacy. Without their heroic struggles and sacrifice the Established Episcopal Church would probably have perished in Great Britain, and Church and State alike would have become subject to Roman Catholic despotism. Let not our Anglican friends forget the Rock from which their civil and religious privileges have been hewn.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY.—THE RELIGIOUS FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES, ETC. By H. K. Carroll, LL. D. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1893. Price \$2.50.

This is the first and introductory volume of the series to be published on American Church History. We could wish for a very different work, and yet perhaps this was all that was possible under the circumstances. We could wish in this volume a comparison of the leading religious forces of this country so as to give the reader an idea of the influence they exert. But in this volume there is simply an enumeration of all churches and sects, with their statistics, as if all were on one plane and of equal influence. This is all right enough for a certain purpose,—perhaps the purpose the author had in view, as indicated in his title, "Religious Forces." Yet it seems strange to find in a work on *Church History* an account of "The Society for Ethical Culture," "The Spiritualists," "Chinese Temples," "Communitistic Societies," etc. We should have liked to see a comparison of the influence exerted by the leading Christian bodies of this country, considered from their origin and history. To a reader unacquainted with the Church, the mixture here of all sorts and sizes will leave him in a wilderness that is really only bewildering. This volume is the one that will be read by the largest number of readers, for it is too much to expect readers generally to wade through all the following volumes, some score or more in number. The members of a given denomination will, for the most part, read only the volume devoted to their own particular church, and the consequence will be that their knowledge of other churches will remain pretty much what it has been, no more or but little more. Still, for the sake merely of the statistics it contains, this volume will prove very interesting to a large circle of readers.

A HISTORY OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. By Henry Eyester Jacobs, Norton Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. Vol. IV. of the Series. New York: The Christian Literature Co. Price \$2.50.

After an introduction the writer considers the subject of Lutheranism in America under different periods: Period I., The Source and Origin of the Lutheran Church in America; Period II., The

first attempt at organization; Period III., Deterioration; Period IV., Revival and Expansion; Period V., Reorganization. The history of the Lutheran Church in this country runs parallel in many respects with that of the Reformed Church. It was composed mainly of German immigrants who came to this country about the same time and for similar reasons with the early Reformed settlers. It came to an organization under Muhlenberg about the same time the Reformed Church was organized under Schlatter, and between these two missionaries the closest intimacy prevailed. Not only Germany but Holland, the New Netherlands and Sweden furnished members for the Lutheran Church in the New World. How this Church passed through the difficulties of its early history is fully and graphically told in this volume.

It seems to be unfortunate that this Church failed to maintain its unity, and became divided into sixteen different independent bodies, and it is to be hoped the divisive period is now passed and the time not far off when these parts shall be gathered together again under one organization. This volume is exhaustive in its treatment of the subject and eminently worthy of a large circulation not only in the Lutheran Church, but among other Evangelical Churches as well.

THE PSALMS. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. Volume II. Psalms xxxix-lxxxix. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1893. Price, \$1.50.

The same excellencies which characterize Dr. Maclaren's first volume on the Psalms, which was noticed in this review just one year ago, characterize this volume also. The expositions which it contains, are, without exception, clear, instructive and edifying. They present just such information as most readers need in order to a proper understanding of this portion of the sacred Scriptures. No one can make them a careful study without deriving much benefit from so doing. Of the various practical commentaries on the Psalms with which we are acquainted, these volumes when the third and last will be added to them, will undoubtedly be one of the very best. They should, therefore, have a large sale. Not merely ministers, but also Sunday-school teachers and all other students of the Bible will find them truly valuable.

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PETER. By J. Rawson Lumby, D.D., Lady Margaret, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street, 1893. Price, \$1.50.

This volume treats of an interesting portion of Sacred Scripture. For though the Epistles of Peter make up but a small part of the New Testament, they are not by any means an unimportant part. As coming to us from the chiefest of the Apostles they will always have a peculiar interest for all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

In the preface to his exposition of these Epistles Prof. Lumby

produces strong arguments in favor of the genuineness of both. After calling attention to the fact that some have seriously assailed that of the Second Epistle, he says: "We cannot, however, go back to the evidence produced at Laodicea. Time has swept that away, but, while doing so, has left us the result thereof; and the acceptance of the Epistle by the fathers there assembled will be judged by most men to stand in lieu of the evidence. No court of law would permit a decision so authenticated and of such standing to be disturbed or overruled."

In his exposition of these Epistles Prof. Lumby is clear and in the main correct. There are some passages, as for example, 1 Peter 3:19, and 1 Peter 4:6, the treatment of which is not altogether satisfactory. In view, however, of the class of readers for which his work is more especially intended, he has, perhaps, after all pursued a wise course. As a whole his book is interesting and scholarly, and will repay study. It is scarcely necessary to say that this volume and the foregoing one on the Psalms form part of the series known as "The Expositor's Bible."

THE SERMON BIBLE. 1 Peter—Revelation. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1894. Price, \$1.50.

This volume completes the "Sermon Bible," and is one of the very best of the series. Its general characteristics are the same as those of the other volumes, and have already been referred to in this Review in connection with notices of those volumes. The sketches of sermons in the present volume, however, are of more than ordinary value. They are not only unusually interesting, but also unusually suggestive. We commend it therefore especially to all who find such works helpful. Those who have the other volumes of the series will of course want this also. Rightly used, the whole series will be found serviceable.

ANTI-HIGHER CRITICISM, or Testimony to the Infallibility of the Bible. By Professor Howard Osgood, D.D., LL.D., President Henry Green, D.D., LL.D., Professor William G. Moorehead, D.D., Talbot W. Chambers, D.D., LL.D., James H. Brookes, D.D., George S. Bishop, D.D., B. B. Tyler, D.D., Professor Ernst F. Stroeter, Ph.D., Professor James M. Stiefer, D.D., and William Dinwiddie, D.D. Edited and compiled by Rev. L. W. Munhall, M.A., author of "Furnishing for Workers," "The Lord's Return and Kindred Truths," "The Highest Criticism vs. The Higher Critics," etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1894. Price, \$1.50.

For the past six years Rev. Munhall has conducted each summer by the seaside an interdenominational Conference, the object of which has been "the promotion of prayerful, critical, exegetical study of the Holy Scriptures." The addresses delivered before the Sixth Annual Conference in Educational Hall, Asbury Park, N. J., August 11-21, 1893, make up the present volume. The subjects discussed in it are the following: Learned Doubt and the Living

Word; the Unity of the Pentateuch; Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch; the Book of Job; the Book of Psalms; Isaiah; the Book of Daniel; the Book of Esther; Messianic Prophecies; the Gospels; the Council in Jerusalem; the Epistles to the Thessalonians; First Epistle of John; and the Testimony of the Bible to Its Own Integrity. The names of the different speakers which are given on the title-page of the volume are in themselves a guaranty that the various subjects discussed are treated in a scholarly and able manner. Though we are not prepared to accept all the views maintained in these addresses, yet we would heartily commend them to all who are interested in the Higher Criticism as well worthy their attention. It is always well to know what can be said on both sides of every question. Truth is seldom all on one side, and the latest view is by no means always the truest. Neither age nor youth are necessarily in themselves a proof of wisdom or folly. It becomes us, therefore, at all times to prove all things and to hold fast only to that which is good.

OUTLINES OF ECONOMICS. By Richard T. Ely, Ph.D., LL. D., Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science and History in the University of Wisconsin. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1894. Price \$1.25.

This is a highly interesting work and will repay careful study. Though primarily intended for use in colleges, it is also well suited to meet the wants of all who would acquaint themselves with the principles of the subject of which it treats. The work itself is divided into four books. The first book gives an historical introduction to the subject, and treats of the economic life of uncivilized, semi-civilized and civilized man, of the industrial revolution in England, of the economic history of the United States, and of the nature of economics and its relation to other social sciences. Book second relates to private economics, and in it production, transfer of goods, distribution and consumption are considered. Book third is devoted to public economics, and discusses public industry and the relation of the State to private enterprises, and also public expenditures and public revenues. The fourth and last book is devoted to the considering of the development of economics, and treats of the economic ideas of the Ancient World, the Middle Ages, and Modern Times, and also of recent economic writers. Though the treatment of the different subjects is brief, it is nevertheless clear and instructive. What Prof. Ely has to say is always worthy of consideration, even though one may not be able to agree with him on all points.

THE REDEMPTION OF THE BRAHMAN. A Novel. By Richard Garbe. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1894. Price 75 cts.

This is a short but highly interesting story of native life in India. No one can read it without being moved with pity for those who

live under the tyranny of false religion. Though not written especially in the interest of Christianity, this little book nevertheless shows how blessed are they who live where Christianity prevails. We commend the work to all our readers.

THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. By F. Max Müller. With an Appendix which contains a Correspondence on "Thought Without Words" between F. Max Müller and Francis Galton, The Duke of Argyll, George J. Romanes and others. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1893. Price in paper, 25 cents.

These lectures were originally delivered in March, 1887, at the Royal Institute in London. They form, as it were, a preface to the author's larger work on the "Science of Thought." Like everything he has written, they are highly interesting and rich with the treasures of superior scholarship. No one can read them without profit, and they deserve the attention of all who are interested in the subject of which they treat. The preface and appendix add greatly to the value of the present issue of them.

THE DISEASES OF PERSONALITY. By Th. Ribot, Professor of Comparative and Experimental Psychology in the College of France. Authorized Translation. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1894. Price in cloth, 75 cents; paper, 25 cents.

A notice of this little volume appeared in this REVIEW for July, 1891. It is now published in cheaper form, as No. 4 of Vol. I. of the "Religion of Science Library." Though we cannot agree with the author in the conclusion at which he arrives, we can nevertheless recommend his work as one containing much interesting information on the subject of which it treats.

THE LUTHERANS. By Prof. E. J. Wolf, D.D., Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

The above is the title of an article originally written for and published in the *National Tribune*, Washington, D. C., September 10, 1891. It is now, by permission, published as a pamphlet of 28 pages, by the Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa., and sold at 10 cents a copy, or 75 cents a dozen. Its purpose is to present a succinct sketch of the Lutheran Church in this country, and to give a brief statement of its doctrines. It is well-written, and contains much valuable information. On a few points its statements, however, are of questionable correctness. With reference to the relation of other Protestant Churches to the Lutheran Church, the author says: "Others went out from her, not she from them. The earliest Reformers in all countries were called Lutherans. And the responsibility for subsequent divisions rests with those who put forth tenets distinctive from and antagonistic to the Mother Church of the Reformation." Unless we have read history altogether amiss, it

would be just as correct, if not more so, to say that the Lutheran Church went out from the Reformed Church. The truth, however, really is, that both Churches, about the same time, and without dependence on each other, renounced the errors of the Roman Church, so that they are twin sisters rather than parent and child. Equally questionable is the implication contained in the following sentence: "The Sacraments which, in common with others, they hold to be signs and memorials, Lutherans regard also as vehicles and bearers of invisible energy, through which the ascended Redeemer touches the individual soul, enduing it in baptism with the beginning of a new life, and nourishing it in the Supper by the communion of His body and blood." What is here claimed as especially the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments, is fully as much the doctrine of the Reformed Church. Had Luther and the older Lutheran divines expressed themselves as Professor Wolf does, we doubt whether Protestantism would ever have been divided as it now is. For our part, we can accept his statement as good Reformed doctrine, and we are glad to learn that this has come to be the view of the Lutheran Church.